DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 701 UD 021 862

AUTHOR	Hawley, Willis D.; And Others
TITLE	Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Summary. Volume I: Strategies for Effective Desegregation: A Synthesis of Findings.
INSTITUTION	Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn. Center for Education and Human Development Policy.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.; Office of Civil Rights (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 81
CONTRACT	NIE-R-79-0034
NOTE	214p.; For other volumes of this Assessment Project, see UD 022 073-080.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Case Studies; Curriculum Development; *Desegregation Effects; *Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnography; Inservice Education; Interviews; Neighborhood Integration; Peer Relationship; *Racial Relations; School Resegregation; *School Support; School Surveys; *Transfer Policy

ABSTRACT

This project report examines strategies for effective school desegregation based on case studies of individual schools, national school surveys, ethnographic studies of classrooms, trend analyses, opinion surveys and conference interviews, and court documents. The strategies identified in the report include the attainment of one or more of the following possible outcomes of desegregation: (1) ending racial isolation among schools and within schools; (2) avoiding resegregation among schools and within schools; (3) improved race relations among students; (4) improvements in academic achievement; and (5) public support for desegregation and school policy. Discussions of pupil reassignment policies, community involvement, and plans for desegregating neighborhoods and housing are related to the findings of the study. Also addressed is the need for structural and curricular changes in schools and more effective inservice training for teachers and administrators. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212701

UD021862

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION STRATEGIES

SUMMARY

STRATEGIES FOR EFFECTIVE DESEGREGATION: A SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

Willis D. Hawley
Robert L. Crain
Christine H. Rossell
Ricardo R. Fernandez
Janet W. Schofield
Mark A. Smylie
Rachel Tompkins
William T. Trent
Marilyn S. Zlotnik

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CENTER FOR EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT POLICY
INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY STUDIES
Vanderbilt University
April 1981

VOLUME I

STRATEGIES FOR EFFECTIVE DESEGREGATION:

A SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

Willis D. Hawley
Robert L. Crain
Christine H. Rossell
Ricardo R. Fernandez
Janet W. Schofield
Mark A. Smylie
Rachel Tompkins
William T. Trent
Marilyn S. Zlotnik

Center for Education and Human Development Policy

Institute for Public Policy Studies

Vanderbilt University

April 1981

Foreword and Acknowledgements

This volume is the central but not the only product of the Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies (hereafter referred to as the Project). The Project was financed with funds provided by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and the National Institute of Education (NIE) of the U.S. Department of Education and administered by NIE under Contract No. NIE-R-79-0034.

There are eight other publications of the Project:

1. A comprehensive review of the empirical research (Volume V).
2. A review of the qualitative literature on school desegregation, including studies surveying the opinions of practitioners and policy makers (Volume VI).
3. An analysis of ten key court decisions (Volume VII).
4. Interviews with local and national experts on school desegregation (Volume VI).
5. A review of actions by state governments and interviews with state officials (Volume VIII).
6. An agenda for future research to determine the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies (Volume II).
7. The design of a multicommunity study to determine the factors that account for the effectiveness of school desegregation (Volume III).
8. A guide to resources that those charged with implementing desegregation might find helpful (Volume IV).
9. A comprehensive bibliography of books, articles, papers, documents and reports that deal with desegregation strategies related to the four general goals outlined above (Volume IX).

All of the persons who participated in this Project, who are listed in the Introduction, had some role in the production of this synthesis. Those listed as authors drafted or revised significant portions of this Project report.

The authors are grateful to several project participants who reviewed drafts of the report and made substantial suggestions. Let us especially acknowledge the contributions of John McConahay, Janet Eyler, Charles Vergon, Thomas Carter, Rosie Feinberg, Jayjia Hsia, Lorenza Schmidt, Susana Navarro, and Meyer Weinberg.

This Project benefitted from the thoughtful advice and the patience of Oscar Uribe of NIE and Mary von Euler, formerly of NIE, now at the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), both of whom served as project officers for the overall study. Janice Pottker of OCR was helpful in coordinating our efforts with that agency and in reviewing and commenting on the project design and the drafts of various publications.

This Project was built on a base of activity supported over the last few years by the Ford Foundation. While no Foundation funds were used directly in this study, the efforts here were substantially facilitated by the Foundation's continuing assistance to our efforts to comprehend and synthesize the research on school desegregation.

WDH, July, 1981

SUMMARY

Strategies for Effective School Desegregation: A Synthesis of Findings

Introduction

Against the background of continuing debates about busing and changes in state and federal policies, school systems throughout the country go about the business of racial desegregation. Until recently, most research on school desegregation has focused on whether desegregation has "worked" or been effective overall. Such research, however, usually provides limited information on the policies or practices that might account for the effects of desegregation and thus offers little guidance to policy makers, educators or parents. For example, knowing that school desegregation, more often than not, has been associated with improved test scores among minority students is important to the debate over school desegregation but in itself such information is not very helpful to parents, educators or judges desiring to enhance the academic achievement of students in desegregating schools because one needs to know why such gains have come about.

This report identifies several strategies that seem to be effective in helping to attain one or more goals of desegregation. It synthesizes data and expert opinion from several different sources in an attempt to provide some guides to actions that seem likely to enhance educational equity and quality in desegregating or desegregated schools.

The different sources of information used in this project, taken together, represent the most extensive evidence on the effectiveness of desegregation strategies yet collected. Members of the project team sought to develop practical advice on how to more effectively desegregate public schools. The specific proposals, however, should not be thought of as hard and fast propositions that will work in all circumstances. Educators, judges and policy makers will need to adapt most of these ideas to local conditions if the proposals derived from this inquiry are to produce maximum benefits for students and communities.

An Overview of the Study

This particular report is the central but not the only product of the Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies (referred to as the project).

Other publications of the project are:

1. A comprehensive review of the empirical research (Volume V).
2. A review of the qualitative literature on school desegregation, including studies surveying the opinions of practitioners and policy makers (Volume VI).
3. An analysis of ten key court decisions (Volume VII).
4. Interviews with local and national experts on school desegregation (Volume VI).
5. A review of actions by state governments and interviews with state officials (Volume VIII).
6. An agenda for future research to determine the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies (Volume II).
7. The design of a multicommunity study to determine the factors that account for the effectiveness of school desegregation (Volume III).
8. A guide to resources that those charged with implementing desegregation might find helpful (Volume IV).
9. An extensive bibliography of books, articles, papers, documents and reports that deal with desegregation strategies related to the general goals outlined below (Volume IX).

The project was financed with funds provided by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and the National Institute of Education (NIE) of the United States Department of Education under Contract No. NIE-R-79-0034.

Desegregation has many different objectives, depending on which court order or plan one reviews or to whom one talks in any given community. Thus the "effectiveness" of a strategy depends on the goal one has in mind. Some strategies help attain some goals and not others. Moreover, some strategies--but not many--enhance the achievement of some goals while impeding the achievement of another.

Strategies identified in the report relate to the attainment of one or more of the following possible outcomes of desegregation:

1. ending racial isolation among schools and within schools
2. avoiding resegregation among schools and within schools
3. improved race relations among students
4. improvements in educational achievement
5. public reaction
    a. avoidance of overt opposition to desegregation
    b. increased levels of racial and ethnic tolerance
    c. support for schools
    d. support for school board candidates who endorse desegregation

The goals discussed here do not all derive from constitutional principles. They are widely held values that policymakers, including judges, frequently seek to secure in the process of desegregation. It is assumed that the most effective strategy will be one that maximizes each of the different goals simultaneously. However, few policies or practices do that and some strategies force one to emphasize one goal over others. When the evidence available illuminates the nature of such tradeoffs, that information is presented.

The report pulls together information from several sources:

1. Quantitative studies that employ various types of statistical techniques to demonstrate a relationship between two or more variables. These range from case studies of particular schools to large national surveys. More than 600 of such studies were reviewed.
2. Qualitative literature that ranges from systematic ethnographic studies of classrooms and schools to reports about national trends or specific situations by informed observers. About 600 of such analyses and descriptions were reviewed.

3. Surveys of opinion and "consensus articles" that are the products of conferences or surveys and reflect perceived agreement about the effectiveness of different desegregation strategies. Four sources of such data were studied.
4. Court documents; each of the 10 cases were examined for evidence and/or expert opinion on different strategies
5. Interviews with 135 local and national experts; interviews with 37 state experts are presented in another report.

The Study Team

This report is a result of a collaborative effort of a number of persons with extensive experience in research on school desegregation. The project has been administered by the Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University.

Members of the study team were:

Carol Andersen	Education Commission of the States
C. Anthony Broh	Rutgers University
Robert L. Crain	Johns Hopkins University, Rand Corporation
Ricardo Fernandez	University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Willis D. Hawley	Vanderbilt University
Rita E. Mahard	University of Michigan, Rand Corporation
John B. McConahay	Duke University
Christine H. Rossell	Boston University
William Sampson	Northwestern University
Janet W. Schofield	University of Pittsburgh
Mark A. Smylie	Vanderbilt University
Rachel Tompkins	Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools
William Trent	Vanderbilt University
Charles B. Vergon	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Meyer Weinberg	University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ben Williams	Education Commission of the States

The Advisory Board

This project benefitted from the advice of a distinguished panel of scholars and practitioners who made suggestions and comments on everything from the project design to the final report. The members of the Board are:

Mary Berry, Professor of History, Howard University and Vice Chairperson, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights

Fred Burke, Commissioner of Education, State of New Jersey

Norman Chachkin, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

Francis Keppel, Professor of Education, Harvard University and Chairman, National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies

Hernan LaFontaine, Superintendent, Hartford Public Schools

Sharon Robinson, Director of Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

Peter Roos, Director of Education Litigation, Mexican American Legal Defense Fund

Franklin Wilson, Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison

The Process of Synthesizing the Information Collected

To be useful, the extensive information collected in this study had to be summarized or synthesized into relatively straightforward conclusions. Variation in the character and quality of the evidence, both across and within the different sources of information, precluded quantitative approaches to aggregation. Instead, all of the evidence related to a given strategy was assembled and the study team member most expert on that strategy prepared a draft summary statement. Different types of evidence were cited in the text and identified by source. The statement of the strategy was then sent to all study team members. The study team met together for an extended period to critique and modify each statement. The statements were then rechecked against the relevant data, especially the expert interviews, and revised once again. The draft was further revised and shared with all study team members, the Advisory Board, and special consultants on the education of Hispanics and persons of Asian background.

In reaching its conclusions, the study team has relied most heavily on social science research whenever the quality of that inquiry allowed. In many cases, however, the evidence needed to answer policy issues faced by those who develop and implement desegregation policies and programs is missing or mixed. We have found expert opinion to be extraordinarily helpful in clarifying these uncertainties. There is, moreover, remarkable agreement among the desegregation experts, both local and national, who offered opinions about the effectiveness of particular strategies.

In the case of some suggestions made in this report, there is little "hard" evidence available but we have presented the proposal when there was agreement among those experts who commented on the issue involved. In a very few cases, where there was no contrary evidence and when the idea was theoretically sensible, unanimous agreement among study team members, all of whom are experienced researchers of school desegregation, was considered an adequate basis for including a proposal. While not all of the evidence relevant to each strategy is presented in the text of this synthesis, the basis upon which the conclusion was reached is specified.

Using the Findings

Our assumption is that research such as this can help to structure the development of desegregation plans and strategies for implementing them. This is not a cookbook for judges, policy makers and front-line educators. We see this report as a source of ideas that will often require adaptation to specific local conditions and that may be inappropriate or unnecessary in many situations. The ideas presented here may also serve as a kind of constraint on behavior in the sense that policies and practices that seem contrary to those we've found to be effective might be re-examined and their justifications clarified. Similarly, those who seek more effective desegregation may find that they can use the information here to raise issues about the absence of certain policies and practices in their schools and communities.

This report would have been more extensive and specific proposals would have been more detailed had we relaxed our concern for consensus within the study team. By requiring consensus among ourselves and some agreement among experts and/or the written literature and court opinions, we have reduced the level of specificity and speculation that a handbook of practical advice might be expected to provide. We have consciously sought to keep this report both comprehensive and brief. The references cited here and the backup information provided in the other volumes from this project add examples, evidence and specificity to the ideas presented here.

How the Findings are Presented

The findings of this study are related to four key steps in securing effective desegregation. The essential first step in desegregation is the design of the pupil reassignment plan to reduce racial isolation and, to the extent possible, achieve or set the stage for achieving other goals of desegregation. A second step is to encourage the desegregation of housing so as to minimize the need for pupil reassignment. Third, the effectiveness of desegregation depends importantly on the development of strategies to involve and prepare and inform the community, and especially parents, so as to build support for and promote compliance with the goals of the desegregation plan.

School desegregation invariably requires changes in the things schools do. Simply reducing isolation and heading off conflict will not be enough to achieve effective desegregation. Thus desegregating school systems need to implement strategies relating to (1) the organization of school systems at the district level to provide continuing support for desegregation, (2) structural and curricular changes within schools and (3) more effective inservice training for teachers and administrators.

Pupil Assignment Plans

The primary objective of a pupil assignment plan is to reduce or eliminate racial isolation in schools. The development of a reassignment plan requires that several considerations be taken into account, including the race, ethnicity and socioeconomic class of the students reassigned, the former racial composition and neighborhood of the schools they are reassigned to, the grades during which they are reassigned, the character and continuity of educational programs, and the distance and costs of transportation. The student reassignment process has political and economic implications, as well as important social and educational consequences that judges, lawyers and school administrators should consider.

Considerations that should be taken into account in developing pupil assignment plans are:

· Desegregation should begin at the earliest possible grade.

· Voluntary desegregation, including plans relying on magnet schools, is not an effective strategy in reducing racial isolation except in districts with small proportions of minority enrollment.

· Mandatory student reassignment plans are an effective way to reduce racial isolation even though they result in greater white flight than do voluntary plans. When pairing or clustering schools for pupil assignment purposes, such linking should take into account the special needs of national origin minority (NOM) students for language and cultural reinforcement programs.

· There is no empirical evidence that one-way busing plans are harmful to minority students. Two-way busing plans, especially when they involve young children, will lead to substantially more white flight from desegregation than will one-way plans. Mandatory black reassignments, whether in one-way or two-way plans, do not provoke black flight and black protest, relatively speaking, even when blacks disproportionately bear the burden of busing. The experts we interviewed generally advocated two-way plans because of equity considerations, the long-term support desegregation will have from minority communities and the possibility that this will facilitate housing desegregation.

· Enrich the curriculum in all schools rather than provide alternative academic magnet schools. It seems desirable to offer college preparatory courses in all secondary schools in order to keep parents with high academic aspirations for their children in the public school system, to avoid resegregation among schools, and to foster educational opportunities for all students.

· Magnet schools used as part of a mandatory plan can both reduce flight and racial isolation. An unintended consequence of instituting magnet schools may be to stigmatize the non-magnet schools as inferior.

· Maximize the efficiency of the assignment and transportation processes. Busing is a symbol on which the community focuses. If pupil assignment and transportation processes are conducted efficiently and smoothly, parents may tend to have more confidence in the ability of the school administration to handle other aspects of the desegregation process. Where appropriate, bilingual, bicultural personnel should be assigned to school buses and sites to avoid confusion and clarify instructions. As a result, there may be less white flight and a better climate of opinion in the community.

· Subdividing the school district into smaller racially balanced districts and permitting reassignment only within these districts reduces options for achieving racial balance.

· Phased-in plans tend to produce more white flight.

· Stability of teacher-student/student-student relationships should be encouraged.

· The deteriorated physical condition of schools contributes to parent reluctance to have their children reassigned to them.

In areas where desegregation will not occur in the immediate future, a program of voluntary metropolitan student transfer should be instituted. Voluntary metropolitan programs cannot be considered adequate substitutes for desegregation programs, since they invariably leave most minority schools nearly as segregated as before.

- Metropolitan plans are effective strategies for reducing racial and class isolation.
- In drawing desegregation plans, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians/Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans should be defined as discrete groups and the educational needs of different subgroups within these groups should be considered.
- When possible, a "critical mass" of between 15-20% of any particular racial or ethnic group should be retained in a given school. In biracial/bi-ethnic situations, intergroup conflict may be greatest when the two groups are about equal in size. This potential for conflict may be greatest when the students involved are of lower socioeconomic status.
- White parents, and perhaps middle class minority parents, are more likely to leave or not enter the public schools if their children are bused (a) to schools in which their students are in the minority, especially in biracial/bi-ethnic situations, or (b) to schools in minority neighborhoods. Other things equal, the higher the socioeconomic status of whites, the more likely they are to flee from desegregation to suburban or private schools.
- The maintenance of a critical mass of students who do relatively well academically seems to contribute not only to the achievement of these students but to students who have been lower achievers.

While all experts agree that busing distances should be kept "as short as possible", there is little evidence that riding the bus, at least for the time periods required in most plans, has a negative impact on students.

Using School Desegregation to Effect Housing Desegregation

It has long been known that housing segregation can segregate schools, and it has been contended in various court suits that the reverse is also true--segregated schools create housing segregation. Now there is some evidence which indicates that school desegregation can promote housing desegregation. This can happen for three reasons. First, when a school district is desegregated there is no pressure for whites with young children to move out of racially mixed neighborhoods since the school administration has guaranteed racial stability. Secondly, any family, white or minority, can move anywhere in the school district knowing that their child will not be the only one of his or her race in the school. Third, school desegregation makes racial steering by real estate agents more difficult since they can no longer use the neighborhood school as a guide to the neighborhood's prestige, nor can they intimidate whites by arguing that certain neighborhoods have schools of inferior quality based on racial composition. Some strategies which seem to promote desegregated housing are:

- Pupil assignment plans should be designed so as to preserve integrated and racially changing neighborhoods
- Plans should provide incentives to segregated neighborhoods to desegregate
- Plans should provide incentives to encourage individuals to move into communities predominantly of the opposite race
- School desegregation plans should include the creation of a school district office concerned with eliminating housing segregation
- Local housing agencies should encourage scattered site housing
- School desegregation plans should involve local and federal housing agencies

Community Preparation and Involvement

Between the time the court order comes down and the time school desegregation is actually implemented, the school district has an opportunity to prepare parents and the community for desegregation to ensure that it will be implemented smoothly and work well. In most cases this opportunity is not well used.

The fears of parents of violence in the schools, of the unknown, and of losing control of their children's lives have important effects on their behavior and, ultimately, on the outcomes of desegregation. The school district and the political and business leadership need to deal with these anxieties if desegregation is to be successful. Yet, often the school district provides parents and community groups little involvement, the mass media exacerbates their fears by covering white flight and protest, and the business and political leadership remain silent.

Post-implementation parental involvement in the schools may ultimately be as important as pre-desegregation involvement if it gives parents the feeling that they have some control over their children's education and their future. Many administrators and teachers, however, see education as a professional matter in which laymen should not intervene. When the context is a highly charged political issue such as school desegregation, that kind of attitude may only create more problems for the school district. Some strategies for community preparation and involvement that appear to be effective include:

- In presenting their views to the community, proponents of desegregation should emphasize the educational programs that will be available as a result of the court order or school board action.
- The school system should take the responsibility for providing newspapers and television with positive stories on desegregation and evidence on school performance, both before and after desegregation, and with press releases about new and innovative school programs. This is a full-time job which requires someone skilled in public information and marketing.
- Parents should be provided with clear and full information about the desegregation plan and its implementation.
- Local and neighborhood leaders should be encouraged to play a more positive role in desegregation controversies. This can be an effective strategy for influencing positive public reaction to desegregation. Leaders of the same race, ethnicity and religion as the persons they hope to influence will be most effective.
- Community preparation before desegregation should include the maximum number of parent visits to other-race schools.
- School systems should maintain contacts with parents who have withdrawn their children from public schools.

Organizing at the District Level for Continuing Implementation

How districts should organize so as to best promote desegregation receives little attention despite some recognition by experts that this can make or break the implementation of the plan. If no effort is made to establish a capability at the district for fostering effective desegregation, it is unlikely that the opportunities created by desegregation will be realized, or that the problems it introduces will be dealt with adequately. Ways of organizing the district to implement desegregation may reinforce propensities to see desegregation as something apart from the central functions and activities of the district. This in turn may lead to failures to adapt to desegregation and to coordinate the full resources of the district in ways that break down the false dichotomy between educational equity and educational quality.

School districts should establish a small, professionally staffed unit in the superintendent's office with the responsibility to enhance the motivation and capability of the operating agencies that administer the central functions of the district.

Mechanisms for monitoring compliance and effective implementation should be established.

Teachers and principals should be involved in the development of desegregation-related policies.

The public information function should be strengthened.

Program evaluation capabilities should be strengthened.

Structural and Curricular Changes in Desegregated Schools

Because school desegregation is often preceded by years of litigation and controversy about the creation of racially or ethnically mixed schools, it is all too easy to think of desegregation in its narrowest sense and to assume that once racially mixed schools have been set up, the desegregation process is complete. However, it is important to recognize that it is precisely at this point in the desegregation process that interracial schooling begins for the students and that the nature of students' experiences is crucial to their academic and social development. Policies and practices that there is reason to believe will help to create school and classroom environments that will foster academic achievement and more positive intergroup relations, and will avoid resegregation include the following:

- Maintain smaller schools
- Maintain smaller classrooms
- Reorganize large schools to create smaller, more supportive learning environments
- Desegregated schools should have desegregated staffs
- Employ minority counselors in desegregated high schools
- Employ an instructional resources coordinator in each school
- Desegregated schools should utilize multiethnic curricula
- Desegregated schools should maximize parental involvement in the education of their children
- Desegregating schools should develop a comprehensive student human relations program
- Opportunities for cooperative learning, including the use of student teams, should be provided in desegregated schools
- Peer tutoring can be a strategy for dealing with achievement diversity
- Eliminate the grouping of students in separate classes by ability in elementary school
- Examine carefully any within-classroom ability groups that do not change
- Eliminate rigid and inflexible tracking and grouping in secondary schools
- School officials, staff and teachers should receive training in and develop explicit policies and procedures for identifying and placing students in special curriculum in non-discriminatory ways

- Establish clear and consistent expectations for student behavior in each school
- Analyze carefully the reasons for disproportionate minority suspensions
- Limit the number of offenses for which suspension and expulsion can be used
- Create alternative in-school programs in lieu of suspensions
- Desegregated secondary schools should ensure desegregated student governments
- Desegregated secondary schools should have a student human relations committee
- Maximize opportunities for student participation in integrated extracurricular activities
- Establish multiethnic in-school parent and teacher committees to provide counseling and to handle grievances of parents, teachers and students

Strategies for Inservice Training

School desegregation presents most educators with new experiences which challenge their professional capabilities and their personal values and dispositions. Almost all desegregation plans or programs provide for some type of inservice training. In addition, most experts agree that inservice training is necessary to prepare educators for changes in schools that result from desegregation.

Despite such agreement and exhortation, educators frequently express skepticism about the usefulness of inservice training for desegregation. Indeed, such doubt regarding the effectiveness of widespread and often uncritically planned and implemented inservice programs may be well founded.

The usefulness of inservice training in any school setting depends on at least four factors. 1) the manner in which training is conducted, 2) the content of training, 3) what groups participate in the training programs, and 4) who conducts such training. Effective strategies for inservice education in desegregated schools include:

- Faculty members, administrators, and non-professional staff should understand the desegregation order, the desegregation plan, and the implications of the plan's implementation to the district, individual schools, and inservice participants.
- Topics of inservice training programs should be germane to individual participants, their needs and day-to-day problems. Program development should be predicated on a needs assessment conducted by school staff.
- Programs that aim for long-range changes need follow-up components which focus on individual problems of participants applying training in the classroom. Classroom implementation of training should be monitored and follow-up sessions should be planned to assist participants.
- The specific content of inservice training should be oriented toward school-level and not district-wide concerns. Small group formats are better than larger multi-school formats because they allow for identification of and concentration on problems of individual participants in single school settings.
- Training should be practical with "hands-on" experience and product-oriented outcomes for immediate application. There is consensus that abstract, theoretically oriented training programs offer little immediate assistance to teachers and administrators and, as a result, participants tend to view such programs as providing slight, if any, benefit.
- Participants should be included in the planning and design of inservice training programs.
- If trainers are brought in from outside the school system, they need knowledge of district and single school matters. Teachers and principals often respond better to peers from their own and other schools than they do to professional consultants.

- Whenever possible, faculty and staff of host schools should be involved in the conduct of inservice training.
- All members of groups being trained should participate. Ideally, training should be perceived by educators as important enough to warrant full participation. Realistically, incentives should be provided for total participation in inservice training. Financial rewards, course credit, or certificate-renewal credit might be offered. If strategies for voluntary participation fail, training should be mandatory.
- Inservice training should be incorporated as a component of total school or district functions. Desegregation-related training should be tied to central concerns of educators such as enhancing achievement and classroom management.
- Training programs should be continuous. Simply providing workshops before schools open or infrequent training sessions is not likely to have much effect.
- Little attempt should be made to directly change attitudes of participants. Preaching is ineffective and often dysfunctional to program goals.
- Program goals should be well established and communicated to participants before training begins.
- Programs on different topics should be coordinated and linkages between training areas should be established to provide continuity.
- Teachers and administrators should participate in programs together since they can reinforce each other to implement what is learned through training programs. Furthermore, teachers and administrators need to develop school-level norms that foster more effective desegregation-related practices.

These recommendations focus on the processes that contribute to effective inservice training of educators regardless of the specific substance of the material being learned. The topics of training which appear to be most important to effective desegregation are:

- Instructional methods for dealing with heterogeneous groups of students
- Curricula development
- Self-awareness, empathy and interpersonal relations
- Discipline and classroom management
- Parental involvement
- Strategies for effective administration at the school and district level

Final Comments

The strategies identified here carry no guarantees. School desegregation, like any other educational policy, depends fundamentally for its success on the commitment and capability of school personnel and the support of those on whom schools most depend, especially parents.

If we had more research focused on the relative effectiveness of different desegregation strategies, educators, parents, judges and policy makers could act with greater certainty. As important as empirical research is the development of ways for educators and parents from different communities to learn about the specific experiences of other communities undergoing desegregation.

This study was not designed to discover whether desegregation invariably benefits students and communities. It does, however, provide a basis for challenging claims that desegregation does not and cannot result in effective education. School desegregation clearly complicates the jobs of teachers and administrators. But, it usually creates greater equality of educational opportunity and often encourages school systems to change to meet their responsibilities to all students. The rather broad range of effective desegregation strategies identified in this study suggest that there is no necessary tradeoff between equity and quality in most American schools. This research, we believe, provides the basis for the development and implementation of policies and practices that will enhance the probabilities that desegregation will benefit children of different races, ethnicities and socioeconomic backgrounds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction.. 1

II. Strategies for Effective Desegregation

A. Pupil Assignment Plans.......................................17
  1. Desegregation should begin at the earliest possible grade.......................................18
  2. Voluntary plans.......................................19
  3. Magnet-only desegregation plans.......................................22
  4. Mandatory student reassignment plans.......................................26
  5. One-way or two-way busing 28
  6. Enriching curriculum in all schools: An alternative to academic magnet schools.......................................29
  7. Magnet schools as part of a mandatory plan.......................................30
  8. Placing magnet schools in minority neighborhoods when the plan is mandatory.......................................31
  9. Maximizing the efficiency of the assignment and transportation process.......................................33
  10. Drawing sub-districts.......................................34
  11. Phasing-in desegregation.......................................35
  12. Encourage stability of teacher-student/ student-student relationships.......................................35
  13. Renovations in schools receiving desegregated student bodies.......................................37
  14. In areas where desegregation will not occur in the immediate future, a program of voluntary metropolitan student transfer should be instituted.......................................38
  15. Metropolitan plans.......................................39
  16. NOM students should be considered as distinct groups.......................................41
  17. The racial/ethnic composition of schools.......................................41
  18. Desegregation plans should take into account the socioeconomic status of students.......................................46
  19. The issue of busing distances.......................................48
  20. Who should be desegregated? Which national origin minorities are racially isolated?.......................................50

B. Using School Desegregation to Effect Housing Desegregation.......................................51
  1. School desegregation plans should be designed so as to preserve integrated and racially changing neighborhoods.......................................52
  2. School desegregation plans should provide incentives to segregated neighborhoods to desegregate.......................................54
  3. School desegregation plans should provide incentives to encourage individuals to move into communities predominantly of the opposite race.......................................55

Page

4. School desegregation plans should include the creation of a school district office concerned with eliminating housing segregation....................57
5. Local housing agencies should encourage scattered site housing....................................59
6. School desegregation plans should include local and federal housing agencies as parties...........60

C. Community Preparation and Involvement........................61
1. In presenting their views to the community, proponents of desegregation should emphasize the educational programs that will be available as a result of the court order or school board action........61
2. Positive media coverage.................................63
3. Parents should be provided with clear and full information about the desegregation plan and its implementation...............................65
4. Supportive community leadership.........................66
5. Establishing multiethnic citizen-parent-teacher-student committees to assist in planning and implementing the desegregation process......................68
6. Community preparation before desegregation should include the maximum number of parent visits to other-race schools......................................70
7. Maintaining contacts with parents who have withdrawn their children...............................71

D. Changes Within Schools

1. Organizing at the district level for continuing implementation..............................73
   a. Organization of essential administrative functions.......................................73
   b. Establishing mechanisms for monitoring compliance and effective implementation.....................76
   c. Involving teachers and principals in the development of desegregation-related policies..........78
   d. Strengthening the public information function.....79
   e. Strengthen evaluation capabilities...............79

2. Structural and curricular changes in desegregated schools..................................81
   a. Maintaining smaller schools.......................83
   b. Maintaining smaller classrooms....................85
   c. Reorganizing large schools to create smaller, more supportive learning environments.......................................86
   d. Desegregated schools should have desegregated staffs..............................86
   e. Employment of minority counselors in desegregated high schools..........................88

Page

f. Employing an instructional resources coordinator in each school........................90
g. College preparatory programs in all secondary schools.................................91
h. Desegregated schools should utilize multiethnic curricula..............................92
i. Desegregated schools should maximize parental involvement in the education of their children.................................95
j. Desegregating schools should develop a comprehensive student human relations program...........97
k. Provide opportunities for cooperative learning, including the use of student teams, in desegregated schools.............................101
l. Peer tutoring can be a strategy for dealing with achievement diversity......................107
m. Eliminate the grouping of students in separate classes by ability in elementary school..........108
n. Examine carefully any within-classroom ability groups that do not change......................109
o. Eliminate rigid and inflexible trackingearning, including the use of student teams and grouping in secondary schools................111
p. Schools officials, staff and teachers receive training in and develop explicit policies and procedures for identifying and placing students in special curriculum in non-discriminatory ways..113
q. Establish clear and consistent expectations for student behavior in each school.............116
r. Analyze carefully the reasons for disproportionate minority suspensions...........117
s. Limit the number of offenses for which suspension and expulsion can be used............119
t. Create alternative in-school programs in lieu of suspensions...........................120
u. Desegregated secondary schools should ensure desegregated student governments................123
v. Desegregated secondary schools should have a student human relations committee................124
w. Desegregated schools should maximize opportunities for student participation in integrated extracurricular activities............125
x. Establishing multiethnic in-school parent and teacher committees to provide counseling and to handle grievances of parents, teachers and students...129

3. Strategies for inservice training.....................131
   a. Conducting inservice training for desegregation..136
   b. Types of inservice training....................142

c. Inservice training related to instructional methods....................................144
d. Inservice training related to curricula..........149
e. Inservice training in self-awareness, empathy, sensitivity, and interpersonal relations.........154
f. Inservice training in discipline techniques......160
g. Inservice training for parent involvement in school affairs.................................165
h. Inservice preparation for principals and administrative staffs...........................167

III. References..172

Introduction

Purpose of the Report

This report identifies several strategies that seem to be effective in fostering the attainment of one or more goals of desegregation. It synthesizes information from several different sources in an attempt to provide judges, lawyers, legislators, educators, parents and other interested citizens with some guides to actions that seem likely to enhance educational equity and quality of desegregating or desegregated schools.

It is widely believed that school desegregation has not "worked" and moreover, that it is not likely to "work." The results of this study, in contrast, carry a more positive message. This report, however, does not focus on whether desegregation has been effective overall (see Hawley, 1981a, for this evidence). Its purpose is to identify what can be done —and has been done in most cases—to improve the benefits and reduce the costs of desegregation. Much of what we have found is not at all surprising. What is surprising is that so few school systems seem to be pursuing many of the relatively obvious policies and practices that seem to hold promise for increasing the positive effects of the desegregation process.

The Goals of Desegregation

Desegregation has many different objectives, depending on which court order or plan one reviews or whom one talks to in any given community. Thus the "effectiveness" of a strategy depends on the goal one has in mind. Some strategies help attain some goals and not others. Moreover, some strategies--but not many—enhance the achievement of some goals while impeding the achievement of another. We identify such conflicts in the discussion of specific strategies.

The strategies we have identified relate to the attainment of one or more of the following purposes:

A. Ending Racial Isolation

1. Among Schools. The literature talks about racial isolation among schools within the same districts in two ways: (a) in terms of racial balance—the similarity of the racial mix of schools with the district-wide norm, and (b) the proportion of minorities attending predominantly minority schools.

2. Within Schools. The concern here is with a range of practices that result in racially identifiable classes and groupings with no demonstrable educational necessity. The problem is how to determine what is a legitimate exception to this rule both in terms of the average amount of time a student may be in a racially identifiable group and what special programs or classes, if any, should be further excepted from this standard. In the literature, and in practice, many of the techniques for ending racial isolation within the schools are the same as those used to avoid resegregation.

B. Avoiding Resegregation

Resegregation has two aspects: (1) the reversal or diminution of a district's or school's desegregation status toward greater racial isolation (this can be measured by regression from the high point of desegregation) and (2) the racial isolation of students within desegregated schools. Resegregation can come about for several reasons:

1. Resegregation among schools may result from:

a. residential exit from the district (flight)

b. changes in residential or birth patterns within the district over time

c. enrollment in private schools (flight)

d. new residents of a given race locating in particular school zones.

2. Resegregation within schools

Sources include disciplinary actions, tracking or inflexible ability grouping, extracurricular activities that do not involve positive steps to facilitate interracial membership, and special program selection and placement. The problem again is to distinguish between benign practices necessary to attaining shared educational objectives and those which are discriminatory and otherwise have negative consequences for students.

C. Improved Race Relations Among Students

There are a substantial number of different measures of race relations, none of which seems to have emerged as a consensus method. The proliferation of measures substantially complicates the problem of assessing the literature. One's measure of race relations is related to one's expectations and values. For example, one might set at the most positive end of the "scale," student choices of work and play partners that reflect patterns of random choices across races (i.e., "color blindness"). But one might also treat reduction of attitudinal prejudice and non-hostile interracial interactions as indicators of positive race relations. The former is seldom found, the latter standard is attained by some strategies.

In our consideration of the literature on race relations, we draw attention to how the findings vary with the measures of race relations used (see Volume V, chapter 2).

D. Improvements in Educational Quality

Two direct measures of educational quality that we focus on here are scores on standardized tests of verbal and quantitative skills. These measures are not without their drawbacks but they are the only ones regularly reported in the literature and utilized in schools.

E. Public Reaction

There are several aspects of public reaction to segregation. Among these are:

1. Overt opposition to desegregation. Protest appears to increase the difficulties of implementing desegregation and to foster white flight. At the same time, peaceful desegregation may reflect suppressed hostility or the presence of a relatively modest plan and cannot, therefore, be taken as an indicator of successful desegregation.
2. Levels of racial and ethnic prejudice in the abstract (i.e., generalized attitudes) and in particular settings (e.g., housing and jobs).
3. Support for schools as measured by citizens' support for financial needs (e.g., votes on bond issues) and parental involvement in school programs.
4. Support for school board candidates who endorse, at least in relative terms, desegregation.

These are not the only goals of desegregation. But, if we knew how these could be attained, we would be a long way toward improving the effectiveness of desegregation policies.

The goals discussed here do not all derive from constitutional principles. They are widely held values that policymakers, including judges, frequently seek to secure in the process of desegregation. It is assumed here that the most effective strategy will be one that maximizes each of the different goals simultaneously. Few policies or practices do that and some strategies force one to emphasize one goal over others. As noted, in a few cases, strategies work to improve the chances of attaining one goal while decreasing the chances of attaining another. When the evidence available illuminates the nature of such tradeoffs, that information is presented. This report does not assume the primacy of one goal over another. Such choices properly belong to policymakers, not to researchers.

The Study Team

This report is a result of a collaborative effort of a number of persons with extensive experience in research on school desegregation. For the first half of the study period, the project was housed at the Center for Educational Policy, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University. Since August, 1980, it has been located at the Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University.*

---

* An important part of the study was conducted, under subcontract, by the National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies of the Education Commission of the States. Ben Williams directed this effort. Other participants in the ECS portion of the study were William Sampson, Northwestern University; Charles Vergon, University of Michigan; and Carol Andersen, Education Commission of the States.

Members of the study team are:*

Carol Andersen	Education Commission of the States
C. Anthony Broh	Duke University
Robert L. Crain	Johns Hopkins University, Rand Corporation
Ricardo Fernandez	University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Willis D. Hawley	Vanderbilt University
Rita E. Mahard	University of Michigan, Rand Corporation
John B. McConahay	Duke University
Christine H. Rossell	Boston University
William Sampson	Northwestern University
Janet W. Schofield	University of Pittsburgh
Mark A. Smylie	Vanderbilt University
Rachel Tompkins	Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools
William Trent	Vanderbilt University
Charles B. Vergon	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Meyer Weinberg	University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ben Williams	Education Commission of the States

The project coordinator is Marilyn Zlotnik. Janet Eyler, Leslie Ward, and Valerie Cook assisted in the preparation of proposals related to resegregation within schools.

---

* Affiliations shown are for the period during which the individuals worked on the study.

The Advisory Board

This project has benefitted from the advice of a distinguished panel of scholars and practitioners who made suggestions and comments on everything from the project design to the final report. The members of the Board are:

Mary Berry, Professor of History, Howard University and Vice Chairperson, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Fred Burke, Commissioner of Education, State of New Jersey

Norman Chachkin, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

Francis Keppel, Professor of Education, Harvard University and Chairman, National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies

Hernan LaFontaine, Superintendent, Hartford Public Schools

Sharon Robinson, Director of Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

Peter Roos, Director of Education Litigation, Mexican American Legal Defense Fund

Franklin Wilson, Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Methodology*

Sources of Information

This report pulls together information from several sources:

1. Quantitative Studies. These studies employ various types of statistical techniques to demonstrate a relationship between two or more variables. They range from case studies of particular schools to large national surveys. About six hundred of such studies were reviewed. The numerous syntheses of empirical studies (e.g. Hawley, 1981b; Weinberg, 1977) are not included because the studies examined in those syntheses were analyzed directly. (These syntheses are cited in our presentation where they provide the reader with an economical reference). Detailed analyses of these quantitative studies are presented in Volume V of the Project. We continued to add information from empirical studies until May, 1981 so that Volume V does not deal with all the quantitative material used in this synthesis.

2. "Qualitative" Literature. The literature reviewed here ranges from systematic ethnographic studies of classrooms and schools to reports about national trends by informed observers. It is sometimes difficult to retain the distinction between qualitative and quantitative studies. For example, some ethnographic studies fall into the latter category because they employ quantitative data in a comparative way while other ethnographic studies use no data or provide data for descriptive rather than analytical purposes. About five hundred and

---

* A more detailed explanation of the methods used to collect and interpret information on different desegregation strategies is provided in the introduction to Volume V.

fifty items of this sort were included in our analysis. The analysis of this literature is provided in Volume VI. A much larger number of papers, articles and reports were examined but were not included because they offered no cause and effect statement about desegregation and one of the outcomes stated above. For example, material that represents opinion about the desirability of desegregation is not included in this analysis. Special attention in this review was given to journals that are particularly concerned with minority education so that the perspectives of minority writers would be represented. In addition, reports on the role of state governments in fostering effective desegregation were also reviewed.

3. Surveys of Opinion - Consensus Articles. Consensus articles are those which represent the collective judgments of informed individuals. For example, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' survey of school superintendents (1976) falls into this category because it is a study not of superintendents' behavior but of their perceptions. Other reports of this type are the product of conferences or surveys and reflect perceived agreements about the effectiveness of different desegregation strategies. We review four items of this sort. An analysis of these studies and reports is contained in Volume VI.

4. Court Documents. The opinions from 10 significant cases were examined in detail. Each of these cases provides evidence and/or expert opinion on different strategies. In each case studied, the original plan was amended. The detailed analysis of these cases is provided in Volume VII. Sections from this volume, which

was prepared by Charles Vergon, are included verbatim in the synthesis.

5. Interviews with Experts. Three types of persons knowledgeable about desegregation were interviewed. We describe them as local, state and national experts. Sixteen districts were selected because they had been desegregated for five years or more and because the strategies they employed were considered to be of interest by the study team. In each district, a handful of knowledgeable persons, usually including educators, a journalist who had followed the desegregation experience, and a representative of the plaintiff or the leading civil rights group advocating desegregation, were interviewed extensively by a member of the study team. In all, 95 local experts were interviewed. Interviews were also conducted with 40 national experts. These experts were selected on the basis of their published writing, their experience as consultants, or their practical experience. The results of these interviews are presented in Volume VI.

    Thirty-seven state officials and persons knowledgeable about the role of the states in facilitating desegregation were also interviewed. Since the focus of this synthesis is on local strategies to facilitate effective desegregation, the information in these interviews is not used directly in this volume. However, state strategies that aid desegregation are useful in and of themselves and are presented in Volume VIII.

One of the serious shortcomings of the literature on school desegregation is the absence of information relating to Hispanics, Asian-Americans and Native Americans. While many school systems have large non-black minority populations, desegregation plans have seldom addressed the special needs of such students (as a convenience, following federal law, we refer to these students at times as national origin minorities--NOMs). To deal in part with this problem we asked five experts on the education of NOM students to systematically review an earlier draft of the synthesis. The five consultants, whose reviews represent a kind of interview, are:

Thomas P. Carter, California State University at Sacramento

Rosa Castro Feinberg, Miami Desegregation Assistance Center for National Origin, University of Miami at Coral Gables

Jayjia Hsia, Educational Testing Service

M. Susana Navarro, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund

Lorenza Schmidt, University of California at Irvine, California State Board of Education

Synthesis of the Information Collected

The different sources of information utilized in this project, taken together, represent the most extensive evidence on the effectiveness of desegregation strategies yet collected. To be useful, however, this information needs to be summarized or synthesized into relatively straightforward conclusions. Variation in the character and quality of the evidence, both across and within the different sources of information, precludes quantitative approaches to aggregation. Instead, all of the evidence related to a given strategy was assembled and the study team member most expert on that strategy prepared a draft summary statement. Different types of evidence were cited in the text and identified by source. The statement of the strategy was then sent to all study team members. The entire study team met together for an extended period to critique and modify each statement. The statements were then rechecked against the relevant data, especially the expert interviews, and revised once again. The draft was further revised and shared with all study team members, the Advisory Board, and our consultants on the education of NOM students.

We have sought to develop practical advice on how to more effectively desegregate public schools. The specific proposals should not be thought of as hard and fast propositions that will work in all circumstances. In the case of some suggestions, there is little hard evidence available but we have presented the proposal when there was agreement among those experts who commented on the issue involved. In a very few cases, where there was no contrary evidence and when the idea was theoretically sensible, unanimous agreement among study team members, all of whom are experienced researchers of school desegregation, was considered an adequate basis for including a proposal. While not all of the evidence relevant to each strategy is presented in the text of this synthesis, the basis upon which the conclusion was reached is specified.

The bias of the study team has been to rely most heavily on social science research whenever the quality of that inquiry allowed. In many cases, however, the evidence needed to answer policy issues faced by those who develop and implement desegregation policies and programs is missing or mixed. We have found expert opinion to be extraordinarily helpful in clarifying these uncertainties. Thus, the conclusions reached rest mainly on these two sources of evidence.

There is, we found, remarkable agreement among desegregation experts, both local and national, about effective strategies for desegregation.

When we say below that the experts supported or opposed a given idea, we do not mean to suggest unanimity. The expertise of experts is not equally appropriate to all issues. The interviews, moreover, were more or less open-ended. So, there is much missing data. Our expert interviews, in short, are not treated as an opinion poll and the percentages of respondents offering a given answer is seldom presented. In no case, however, do we make proposals about which the research and the consensus of expert opinion are in conflict.

Using the Information

Our assumption is that research such as this can help to structure the development of desegregation plans and strategies for implementing them. This is not a cookbook for judges, policy makers and front-line educators. We see this report as a source of ideas that will often require adaptation to specific local conditions and that may be inappropriate or unnecessary in many situations. The ideas presented here may also serve as a kind of constraint on behavior in the sense that policies and practices that seem contrary to those we've found to be effective might be re-examined and their justifications clarified. Similarly, those who seek more effective desegregation may find that they can use the information here to raise issues about the absence of certain policies and practices in their schools and communities.

We want to emphasize our conviction that the degree to which these numerous proposals will enhance the effectiveness of desegregation depends on the sophistication with which they are adapted to fit local conditions and the energy, commitment, and intelligence given to their implementation.

As we've noted, many of the proposals set forth in this report seem quite unsurprising. We do hope, indeed, that they will be considered commonsensical. If many of the ideas presented here are intuitively sensensible, so much the better. The fact is, however, that many, if not most desegregating school systems, seem to be doing things different from those outlined here or seem not to be doing many of the things that hold promise for improving the effectiveness of desegregation. In some cases, political obstacles are apparent and a few of the ideas set out here are financially costly. Such explanations for why these ideas are not more widely implemented, however, do not account for the infrequency with which school systems adopt comprehensive approaches to desegregation that embody appropriate strategies suggested in the pages below.

This report would have been more extensive and specific proposals would have been more detailed had we relaxed our concern for consensus within the study team. By requiring consensus among ourselves and some agreement among experts and/or the written literature and court opinions, we have reduced the level of specificity and speculation that a handbook of practical advice might be expected to provide. We have consciously sought to keep this report both comprehensive and brief. The references cited here and the backup information provided in the other volumes from this project add examples, evidence and specificity to the ideas presented here.

There are three other books that appear to provide very helpful advice to the developers and implementers of desegregation plans to which the person in search for more detailed advice might turn.

Smith, Downs and Lachman's (1973) book Achieving Effective Desegregation, and Desegregating America's Schools by Hughes, Gordon and Hillman (1980), provide useful advice on the development of desegregation plans.

The two books provide details on the processes of desegregation planning that is lacking in this one. But those volumes lack this book's emphasis on programs that will change schools and children and communities in ways that facilitate attaining the goals of desegregation. Garlie Forehand and Marjorie Ragosta's (1976) Handbook for Integrated Schooling provides particularly helpful advice on things that can be done within schools to foster effective desegregation, especially with respect to the goals of equitable treatment of different races and better race relations. We cite this study frequently in this text. Not all of our findings are similar to ideas presented in these three books, but few of our proposals are inconsistent with the suggestions these other analyses offer.

The Presentation of the Strategies

Our review of the literature, court cases and expert interviews resulted in the identification of numerous ideas for facilitating the attainment of the goals of desegregation upon which this study has focused. The strategies outlined here are what might be called "middle level strategies." In most instances, variations on a particular strategy presented here could be identified. However, we sought to keep this report relatively concise and to aggregate the evidence about types of strategies so as to enhance the certainty one might have about the consequences of each approach discussed. The presentation of each strategy usually has three parts. First, the strategy is described and its consequences are identified. Second, the nature of the evidence relating to this strategy is discussed. Third, when it adds information or clarity, illustrative examples are provided. Such illustrations are not, however, always appropriate to the types of recommendations made, as the reader will see.

Developing and implementing an effective desegregation plan involves several considerations that serve to organize this book. The essential first step in desegregation is, of course, the design of the pupil reassignment plan to reduce racial isolation and, to the extent possible, achieve or set the stage for achieving other goals of desegregation.

School desegregation would be much less controversial and much less necessary if housing were desegregated. The second part of this book identifies school desegregation strategies that could lead to reductions in racially segregated housing.

The effectiveness of desegregation depends importantly on the extent to which the community is prepared for and involved in the process. The third section of the report identifies strategies to involve and prepare the community at a district-level so as to build support for and promote compliance with the goals of the desegregation plan.

School desegregation invariably requires changes in the things schools do. Simply reducing isolation and heading off conflict will not be enough to achieve effective desegregation. The fourth section of the report identifies strategies relating to (1) the organization of school systems at the district level to provide continuing support for desegregation, (2) structural and curricular changes within schools and (3) more effective inservice training for teachers and administrators. Inservice training is discussed last in this report to emphasize the importance of seeing this activity as an on-going one rather than something to be done only at the point of preparation for the initial desegregation of schools.

Pupil Assignment Plans

The primary objective of a pupil assignment plan is to reduce or eliminate racial isolation in schools. The constitutional standard is, generally, to bring about "the maximum amount of actual desegregation in light of the practicalities of the local situation" (Green v. New Kent County, 1968; and Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, 1971).

The development of a reassignment plan requires that several considerations be taken into account. These should comprise a broad range of factors, including the race, ethnicity and socioeconomic class of the students reassigned, the former racial composition and neighborhood of the schools they are reassigned to, the grades during which they are reassigned, the character and continuity of educational programs, and the distance and costs of transportation.

The decisions made importantly influence outcomes of desegregation. Typically the school administration and the courts place primary emphasis on the logistical and political implications of the reassignment process. For example, in many school desegregation plans, kindergarteners and first graders are excluded from the reassignment process solely because parents are opposed to having their youngest children reassigned. Other features of the reassignment process are often chosen primarily for their administrative simplicity. Evidence from research and desegregation experts, however, suggests that the reassignment process has not only political and economic implications, but important social and educational implications that judges, lawyers and school administrators should consider. Moreover, such considerations should rest on more than the views of persons whose expert qualifications are verified primarily by their selection as expert witnesses by the adversaries in a desegregation suit.

Desegregation Should Begin at the Earliest Possible Grade

It is important that school desegregation encompass at least twelve grades and it would be even better if it also included kindergarten. However, because of parental opposition, most desegregation plans omit kindergarten, and some also exclude the early primary grades. Excluding early grades from the plan and then bringing the students in when they reach a certain grade can be harmful to student achievement because changing both schools and classmates in the middle of elementary education is disruptive. Moreover, racial and ethnic attitudes develop early and adjusting to multi-racial or multiethnic environments and avoiding racial and ethnic stereotypes is much more difficult for older students than it is for younger students. Excluding students with limited English proficiency may facilitate bilingual education in some cases but would discourage achievement, and linguistic and ethnic contact.

Evidence. An extensive review of the desegregation and achievement literature has been completed and is described in detail in Volume V of this Project (Crain & Mahard, 1981). Both that review and its predecessor (Crain & Mahard, 1978) present very convincing evidence that desegregation begun in kindergarten or grade one will enhance minority achievement test scores much more than desegregation begun in later grades.

There is very little direct evidence from desegregated schools which allows us to state with great confidence that early desegregation has a more positive effect on race relations than later desegregation. There are, however, a number of empirically and theoretically based reasons for expecting this. Empirical research on the development of racial awareness and racial attitudes shows that young children tend not to have as clear a racial awareness, nor to have developed the elaborate stereotypes that older children have acquired (Katz, 1976). Coleman and his colleagues (1966) found that desegregation at the earliest possible grades was associated with better race relations in later years of schooling. This point was also made by Holt in her expert testimony in the original Brown v. Board of Education case (Kluger, 1977).

Allowing the early primary grades to remain segregated also has the effect of encouraging whites to leave racially changing neighborhoods (i.e., integrated) and move to segregated areas. For the same reason, omitting any grades from a desegregation plan inhibits minority families from moving into white areas.

One unintended consequence of a strategy of including early grades in the desegregation plan may be to produce, at least when they are initially reassigned, greater white flight. Rossell (1978a), Rossell and Ross (1979), and the Massachusetts Research Center (1976), found more withdrawal of elementary white students upon desegregation than of secondary students.

Comment. This issue has grown in importance since, despite the evidence that this is not in the best interests of the children, the Dallas school system, the Nashville-Davidson County school system (for 1981-82), and the Los Angeles school system (from 1977-79) all under court order, have excluded grades K-3 from busing in response to parental opposition.

Voluntary Plans

Voluntary desegregation plans allow a student to both remain in the public school system and have a choice as to whether to be reassigned to a desegregated school. A white student is thus free to remain at his/her current segregated school, although minorities may be transferred in at their own request, and a minority child may remain at his/her segregated school, although whites may request to transfer in (highly unlikely unless the school involved is a magnet school or otherwise exceptional). Voluntary plans can be court-ordered (as in Houston and San Diego) or board-ordered as are the majority-to-minority transfer plans adopted or proposed in most school districts with a minority population above 5% or 10%. Voluntary desegregation is not an effective strategy in reducing racial isolation except in districts with small proportions of minority enrollment. The two most common voluntary strategies are open enrollment, or "freedom of choice" plans, and magnet schools.

Evidence. The qualitative and quantitative research (Rossell, 1978b, 1979) indicate a negative relationship between whether a plan is voluntary and the reduction in racial isolation accomplished because, 1) few, if any, whites opt to transfer to minority schools, 2) the minorities who volunteer to attend white schools tend to be mostly blacks (few Hispanics participate), and 3) those blacks who do volunteer to attend white schools tend to be disproportionately secondary students. The experts interviewed indicated that the fact that voluntary plans tend to be one-way, that is, blacks volunteering to attend white schools but no whites volunteering to attend black schools, contributes to two phenomena which are dysfunctional to the long run goals of desegregation: 1) it makes it appear that school desegregation is a minority problem, and 2) minorities always remain the "outsiders" being bused in. The courts have been increasingly skeptical of voluntary plans.

Because they accomplish little reduction in racial isolation and because whites are not forcibly reassigned out of their neighborhood schools, voluntary plans produce less white flight and community protest than do mandatory plans (Rossell, 1978a). Another possible effect of voluntary plans might be to protect bilingual education programs that might be undermined if limited English speaking students were scattered by a mandatory plan. So-called voluntary plans may not be equally voluntary for all income and ethnic groups. For example, in San Diego, demographic and programmatic circumstances make it more difficult for some Hispanic students to leave their schools without experiencing high transportation costs and losing access to bilingual programs.

Illustrative examples. A desegregation plan proposed for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools in 1965 provided for the establishment of geographic attendance areas and a freedom of choice option to students desiring to attend a school other than the one to which they were assigned on the basis of the area of their residence. The plan was approved by the district court and affirmed by the Fourth Circuit. An analysis of the projected impact of the free transfer provision in the first year of plan implementation led to the following findings: "all or practically all" of the 396 white students initially assigned to black schools as a result of the geographical zoning exercised their freedom of choice option to transfer out of the formerly black school and 91 of 1,955 black students elected to be reassigned from a white to a black school.

Three years later, in declaring the plan inadequate in light of intervening legal developments, the federal district court observed that:

> Freedom of students of both races to transfer freely to schools of their own choice has resulted in resegregation of some schools which were temporarily desegregated. The effect of closing the black inner-city schools and allowing free choice has in overall result tended to perpetuate and promote segregation. (300 F.Supp. 1366)

Magnet-Only Desegregation Plans

In a magnet-only desegregation plan, a certain number of designated "magnet" schools with special educational programs proaches to instruction. In most cases, requirements are estab magnet schools be racially nonidentifiable, sometimes holding t schools to a more exact approximation of district racial compos non-magnet buildings. Magnet schools have focused on "gifted" vocational education, the arts, science or more traditional clas structures and teaching practices. A campaign is launched to re minority and white student volunteers. It is hoped that suffici students will enroll in these schools as a result of their educat attractiveness to achieve the racial balance quotas, and thus in integration in the school district without placing the burden so minority students as most voluntary plans do. Federal ~~courts~~ h ally been critical of magnet-only plans in districts with sizab populations.

Evidence. Rossell (1979) finds that only in school distri 30% minority can magnet schools by themselves accomplish much tion in a school district. School districts above 30% minority magnet-only plans have significantly lower levels of racial bal interracial contact (proportion white in the average minority school) than when they have mandatory desegregation plans. Whe are part of a mandatory play they can effectively attract stud desegregated settings (see below).

Experts agree that whites are less likely to enroll in magnet schools located in minority neighborhoods than they are if the school is in a white, racially mixed or commercial area. Loveridge (1978) found that parents with students enrolled in a magnet school program were more favorable toward desegregation than parents whose children were not.

Illustrative examples. Pursuant to a finding of unconstitutional segregation in the Buffalo schools, the district proposed the adoption in 1977 of the "Buffalo Plan." The purportedly voluntary pupil assignment plan utilized ten magnet schools as the primary technique for desegregating selected inner-city, minority identifiable buildings, while incorporating a voluntary transfer program under which minority students could elect to attend formerly white schools on the periphery of the city. Although a substantial reduction in the number of elementary students attending racially isolated schools was reported betweeen the 1975-76 and 1977-78 school year, (26,173 to 7,845 students by defendant's figures), at least 15 all-minority schools remained under the plan. The continued existence of these one-race schools plus the implication of data presented showing that the reduction in students attending one-race schools was largely due to the elimination of all majority schools, suggests that the magnet school facet of the Buffalo Plan was not particularly effective in attracting whites to formerly minority schools. The court was also disturbed by the inequity of the plan which in fact made reassignment mandatory for substantial numbers of minority students whose buildings were closed while white participation via the magnet school program was totally voluntary.

Four years after the implementation of a court-approved desegregation plan in Pasadena calling for mandatory pupil reassignment so that no school would be more than 50% minority, the school board petitioned the court for permission to substitute an integrated zone magnet school approach. The court rejected as unsubstantiated the white flight thesis advanced by school district experts and found the evidence introduced regarding the absence of educational benefits or inadequacies of the original plan "neither persuasive nor adequate" (375 F.Supp. 1304, 1307-08).

In rejecting the proposed magnet plan, the court noted that it would have to overcome a number of potentially imbalanced schools, something that Pasadena and "other California districts laboring under freedom of choice plans have been less than spectacularly successful in achieving ...." In a footnote to its opinion the court observed that freedom of choice plans in San Bernadino and Richmond resulted in limited (11-15%) black participation and a total absence of white involvement (375 F.Supp. 1304, 1307 and fn. 12). The district court's retention of jurisdiction and rejection of the magnet plan was affirmed by the 10th Circuit and not considered by the Supreme Court (Pasadena Board of Education v. Spangler, 427 U.S. 424, 1976).

Among the score of proposals advanced to desegregate Wilmington and New Castle County was one which would establish a system of magnet schools within each of five city-suburban zones of like racial composition. In 1976, the Court observed, "[T]he use of [magnet schools] as the sole means of system-wide desegregation is decidedly unpromising." Notice was taken that a similar plan operating in Houston, called to its attention by the State Board of Education, evidenced little success in actually desegregating the schools and even increased segregation in some buildings (416 F.Supp. 345).

Racine, Wisconsin, and Tacoma, Washington, both with small minority populations, have been able to successfully desegregate their school systems with magnet schools. High proportion minority school systems, such as Houston, however, have been unable to do so. Seattle, Washington tried to desegregate with magnet schools, but found it too expensive. After one year, the Board voted to switch to a mandatory desegregation plan. The experience of San Diego is mixed but magnet schools offering remedial or compensatory programs (e.g., transition, bilingual education) apparently will not attract majority students.

Comments. Little is known about the types of magnets that consistently attract students of different races, ethnicity and family background. Some experts we interviewed believe that magnet schools offering bilingual programs might appeal to a certain number of parents whose children speak satisfactory English but would like to learn a second language. Coral Ways School in Dade County, Florida (Miami) is an integrated, totally bilingual school.

One of the most popular types of magnet schools is one for academically talented students. The experts we interviewed were nearly unanimous in their opposition to these schools. They are seen as expensive, and they may reduce academic programs and the heterogeneity of comprehensive schools. Academic magnets may also induce flight among parents whose children apply but are not admitted to the school.

The relatively small size of most magnets and their specialized character may have the effect of excluding students in need of bilingual education. Further, when the targets for racial composition are set, minority students are sometimes treated as though they were all the same. Instead, racial composition should be set by considering the proportion of each different racial and ethnic group in the district's population.

Mandatory Student Reassignment Plans

This involves the mandatory reassignment by the school administration of students from segregated schools to schools where their presence will increase racial balance. Such plans are termed mandatory because parents have no choice as to their child's reassignment if they want their child to remain in the public school system. Mandatory student reassignment desegregation plans can be ordered by a school board (as in Berkeley and Seattle) or by a court, as in San Francisco, Boston, Denver, etc., or by the U.S. Department of Education (formerly the Department of Health, Education and Welfare), as in Baltimore, Wichita, and Amarillo.

Mandatory plans commonly employ one or a combination of reassignment techniques. Among the more prevalent techniques are establishing geographic boundaries where none previously existed, redrawing pre-existing boundaries, closing old or constructing new schools, pairing or clustering buldings, reorganizing grade structures and feeder patterns, and reassigning students and providing transportation where appropriate in conjunction with the utilization of any of the above techniques.

When pairing or clustering schools for assignment purposes, such linking should take into account the special needs of national origin minority (NOM) students for language and cultural reinforcement programs.

Evidence. This strategy is the most effective method of reducing racial isolation because although mandatory white reassignment produces a greater loss of whites to private or suburban schools than a voluntary desegregation plan, it still produces a greater proportion white in the average minority child's school than a voluntary plan (Rossell, 1978a).

Some experts believe that mandatory desegregation plans are desirable because under such plans schools are more likely to make special preparation or educational changes and minority students are more likely to have a critical mass of fellow minorities accompany them when they are reassigned to white schools. A critical mass of national origin minority students in a school facilitates the provision of effective bilingual education.

When minority students are mandatorily reassigned to white schools, but whites are not reassigned to minority schools (as in Riverside and Ann Arbor), there is a greater reduction in racial isolation than if the plan is completely voluntary. However, under such "one-way" busing plans, desegregation is seen as a minority problem and minorities are the outsiders. In addition, mandatory reassignment of minorities but not of whites contributes to the idea that whites have control over their own fate, but minorities do not.

Mandatory reassignment plans occasion greater white and middle class flight and more protest than do voluntary plans. However, even where substantial white flight has occurred, racial isolation has remained significantly less than it was before desegregation occurred (Rossell, 1980).

In general, mandatory plans have achieved substantial reductions in racial isolation in all regions of the country (Taeuber & Wilson, 1979). This is true even in districts where there has been substantial white flight (Rossell, 1980).

One-Way or Two-Way Busing

Pupil assignment plans which bus minorities into pre-desegregation white schools, but do not bus white children—at least not many white children—to minority neighborhoods, are called one-way busing plans. Two-way plans require minorities and whites to share the "burdens" of sending one's children to school outside one's neighborhood. The expert consensus is that two-way plans are preferable.

Evidence. There is no empirical evidence that one-way busing plans are harmful to minority students. There is evidence that two-way busing plans, especially when they involve young children, will lead to substantially more white flight from desegregation than will one-way plans (Rossell, 1978a). Mandatory black reassignments, whether in one-way or two-way plans, do not provoke black flight and black protest, relatively speaking, even when blacks disproportionately bear the burden of busing. Blacks in most cities (no evidence is available concerning other minorities) have been willing to accept the extra burden of busing (e.g., Riverside, Tampa, Milwaukee, Fort Wayne, etc.) though black protest against one-way busing seems to be increasing (e.g., in Nashville, Fort Wayne and Portland, Oregon; see also Alexander, 1979).

One-way busing plans, however, regardless of their effect on students, protest and flight, raise equity questions with which each community must deal. The experts we interviewed generally advocated two-way plans because of equity and the long-term support desegregation will have from minority communities. These plans do provide planners with more options to reduce racial isolation and substantially change the likelihood that schools will be closed in black neighborhoods and that new schools will have to be built. Two-way plans may also facilitate housing desegregation, especially where options for white flight are not great.

Enriching Curriculum in All Schools: An Alternative to Academic Magnet Schools

Although academic magnet schools may reduce the perceived costs of desegregation to some parents who consider their children academically gifted, they also may stigmatize the non-magnet schools in a desegregated school district. This, in turn, may induce the flight of families not in the magnet. It seems desirable to offer college preparatory courses in all secondary schools in order to keep parents with high academic aspirations for their children in the public school system, to avoid resegregation among schools, and to foster educational opportunities for all students.

Evidence. The qualitative research supports the proposition that general curriculum enrichment will reduce white flight, but there is no quantitative evidence on this question. As noted earlier, the experts interviewed generally endorsed that avoidance by school systems of academic magnets, i.e., those schools for "academically gifted" students, will minimize inequities. They also tended to believe that academic magnets reduce advanced academic courses in "regular" schools. The absence of these courses may mean that students who are very able in one subject, but not in another, will have reduced opportunities, and the motivated students, who might aspire to advanced classes, will be undermined. In this regard, nearly all of the national experts agreed that it is somewhat easier to improve schools with the implementation of desegregation because in most cases a new agenda is being set and external resources and pressures for change exist.

Illustrative example. School officials in New Castle County stated that fear over the loss of specific courses was an important if not critical concern of white parents.

Magnet Schools as Part of a Mandatory Plan

In many districts, magnet schools have been used as educational options within a district-wide mandatory desegregation plan. Students are mandatorily assigned to a desegregated school, or they can opt for a desegregated magnet school with an educational specialization.

Evidence. These plans can both reduce flight and racial isolation. The quantitative research (Rossell, 1979) indicates that it is the mandatory aspect of these desegregation plans which accomplishes the reduction in racial isolation, not the educational option (which many people mistakenly believe is a "voluntary" component of the plan). Moreover, the vast majority of the qualitative research studies, as well as the interviews, find that mandatory student reassignment is necessary to reduce racial isolation any more than a token amount.

One reason given for instituting magnet schools as part of a mandatory desegregation plan is that the inclusion of educational choices may lessen community hostility to the forced aspects of the plan, increase the educational attractiveness of the schools, and as a result reduce white flight and protest. There is no evidence that this is the case.

One unintended consequence of instituting magnet schools may be to stigmatize the non-magnet schools as inferior. This is particularly likely if the magnet schools include academic, admission-by-examination schools. Moreover, exam schools may resegregate the school system by class and thus partly diminish the positive academic effects of socioeconomic desegregation.

Illustrative examples. The number and prominence of magnet schools vary substantially from community to community with the specialized curricula associated with each building largely left to local school officials in most (Boston, Milwaukee, Wilmington) but not all instances (Detroit). In some cases, notably Boston and to a lesser extent Detroit, the court ordered the establishment of university, business, labor, or community-school pairings to facilitate the development and support of distinctive and responsive magnet programs. In Detroit, several city-wide magnet schools emphasizing vocational education were ordered instituted by the federal district court as part of a broader, mandatory-reassignment program. In addition to the establishment of the vocational program, the court ordered the construction or remodeling of facilities to house them, approving a 50-50 cost sharing agreement negotiated between the guilty local and state co-defendants for the construction of the two new vocational centers.

In Boston, with 22 magnet schools within a 150 school system, the non-magnet schools are typically described as inferior to the magnet schools. As a result they have been less successful in holding students. "Magnets" are a central part of the Milwaukee plan and seem to have been quite attractive to parents in that city. Houston, however, despite the fact that it developed an imaginative and expensive magnet-only plan (no required busing), has not been able to attain substantial reductions in racial isolation.

Placing Magnet Schools in Minority Neighborhoods When the Plan is Mandatory

One potentially effective option for minimizing white flight while maximizing racial balance within a mandatory desegregation plan is a two-stage reassignment process. The first stage is voluntary and includes the creation of magnet school programs over a four or five month period in the pre-implementation year. All magnet schools might be located in minority neighborhoods, though such schools will be less attractive to whites than schools in all-white or racially mixed areas. Some of them should be "fundamental" schools in order to attract white parents whose image of minority schools is that they are unsafe and lacking in discipline. Magnets located in badly deteriorating minority schools, or the most racially isolated, will be less successful than those placed in newer schools, or those on the border of racially isolated neighborhoods.

The first stage of the reassignment process would then begin with the magnet school reassignment. The evidence from Boston suggests that there are a significant number of whites who are willing to put their children in schools in minority neighborhoods, if these schools are publicized as superior schools and if the alternative is mandatory reassignment to another desegregated school chosen by the school administration (Massachusetts Research Center, 1976; Rossell & Ross, 1979). It is important that this be done on an individual basis rather than a school basis as in Los Angeles. There, schools were asked to volunteer for pairings and clusters with the alternative being later mandatory pairing. The problem with this policy is that when whole schools are asked to volunteer, rather than individuals, any given school may have enough parents who oppose this action, and as a result withdraw their children, to virtually eliminate any chances of achieving racial balance.

After white parents are asked to volunteer for magnet schools in minority neighborhoods, the additional seats in minority schools can be filled by mandatory reassignment of whites. Minorities can also be reassigned by the same process (i.e., they can either volunteer for a magnet school or accept the school district's assignment).

If the one purpose of this two-stage reassignment process is to increase the prestige and resources of minority neighborhoods and schools, and thus lessen white flight overall, magnet schools should not be placed in white neighborhoods. The only exception to this might be the placing of a magnet school in a lower status white neighborhood whose prestige and resources need to be increased as much as those of the minority neighborhoods.

Evidence. Other than the evidence cited above that many whites, depending on the city, are willing to volunteer for magnet schools in minority neighborhoods if the alternative is mandatory reassignment to a non-magnet desegregated school, there is no quantitative evidence that this type of reassignment process will reduce white flight. The qualitative research is equivocal on the subject.

Magnet schools may increase the status of minority schools and minority neighborhoods. On the other hand, they may increase minority frustration since many minorities will be denied the opportunity to attend a superior school in their neighborhood because it is necessary to leave seats for whites from outside the neighborhood.

Maximizing the Efficiency of the Assignment and Transportation Process

Busing is a symbol on which the community focuses. If the pupil assignment and transportation process is conducted efficiently and smoothly, parents may tend to have more confidence in the ability of the school administration to handle other aspects of the desegregation process. Where appropriate, bilingual, bi-cultural personnel should be assigned to school buses and sites to avoid confusion and clarify instructions. As a result, there may be less white flight and a better climate of opinion in the community.

Evidence. There is no hard evidence to support this. Some of the experts interviewed and several qualitative commentaries support this position.

Illustrative examples. The Associate Superintendent of Stockton, California traveled with the Director of Research to every desegregated school district in California to find out what improved implementation efficiency and what didn't. They found, for example, that one school district had tried to get first graders on the right bus in the morning and afternoon, although they cannot read, by putting colors on the front of the bus and then tagging the students with that color. Unfortunately this same district found that 6% of their students were color blind. The Stockton administrators found another school district which had anticipated that problem and put animals on the front of the bus, only to discover that first graders cannot always tell one animal's silhouette from another. The Stockton administrators decided to cover all bases by putting colored animals on the front of the bus and then tagging each student with his/her colored animal. This minimized the number of lost youngsters and they believe it greatly enhanced public confidence in the plan and, as a result, reduced white flight.

Drawing Sub-Districts

Many school districts attempt to maintain a neighborhood element to their school desegregation plan by subdividing the school district into smaller racially balanced districts with reassignment only within these districts. This approach, however, reduces options for achieving racial balance.

Evidence. Rossell and Ross's (1979) analysis of Boston suggests that it is inadvisable to draw inviolable sub-district attendance zones, even if initially racially balanced, particularly when there is only residential area included in the attendance zone. The advantage of a city-wide plan with no sub-districts is that school authorities are able to redraw attendance zones and reassign students from all over the city whenever necessary to stabilize schools. If the plan uses sub-districts for administrative purposes, the central administration should be able to redraw them when necessary.

Phasing-In Desegregation

Many school districts implement their desegregation plan in stages in order to make the process more manageable. Thus, in the first year of desegregation, grades 1-8 may be desegregated and in the second year, grades 9-12 are added to the plan (as in Racine). Plans can also be phased in by geographic area (as in Boston). In this situation, one area of the school district is desegregated in the first year and the rest in the second and/or third year.

Evidence. Phasing-in plans tend to produce more white flight than one would expect from the total amount of reassignments because there is greater white flight during the first year in anticipation of future reassignments. In short, the more warning people are given about desegregation, the more white flight results (Rossell, 1978a; Armor, 1980).

The national experts interviewed were nearly unanimous in disapproving of phased-in plans.

Encourage Stability of Teacher-Student/Student-Student Relationships

Among the considerations desegregation planners should deal with is the general desirability of stability in the relationships students have with their peers and with their teachers. Thus, once racial isolation has been substantially reduced, changes in pupil assignments should be minimized. Such stability may be particularly important to NOM students and others who require bilingual and special education classes.

Evidence. There appears to be no research on the importance of stability in the context of desegregation. Some local and national experts, and the members of the study team, point to several probable advantages of encouraging stability. These observations, if not supported by the research, are consistent with it.

1. Minimizing changes in the composition of a student cohort is likely to minimize conflict over which group will control what territory and facilitate the development of good interpersonal relationships, especially among high school and junior high school students.
2. Minimizing changes for individual students will reduce the personal anxiety many young people feel in new settings, and increase continuity in the curriculum experienced. When movement is necessary, the sending and receiving schools should try to coordinate their curricula.
3. Stability in teacher-student relationships should facilitate the understanding of students' learning needs (assuming stereotypes are avoided and high expectations maintained) and the maintenance of social order in the school should be facilitated because few students will be unknown to those in authority (Gottfredson & Daiger, 1979).
4. Minimal changes in pupil assignment plans and in the number of different schools attended should help parents feel more

confident about being involved in the education of their children. Some experts believe that the uncertainty about the schools their children will attend causes some parents to flee from the public schools.

Comment. This emphasis on stability is not meant to diminish the importance of dealing with resegregation; the stability argument can be, and has been, used as an excuse not to reduce racial isolation. What we are saying is, when plans are drawn and the problem of resegregation among schools is considered, the stability issues raised here should be taken into account. Achieving more stability for students and parents is complicated by the incremental character of many plans. School systems that phase in desegregation plans by grades or geographic areas will invariably induce more instability. Likewise, efforts to minimize desegregation initially keeps the issue in the courts, so that the prospect of pupil reassignment remains a lingering prospect.

In initial assignment plans, and when transfers are necessary, attempts might be made to (a) keep families together, which some experts emphasize is particularly important in NOM settings, (b) limit the number of schools to which students in a given school should be assigned, so that there would be a critical mass of students reassigned who knew each other, and (c) transfer teachers and students together so that students reassigned would still know and be known by several teachers.

Renovations in Schools Receiving Desegregated Student Bodies

Since minority schools tend to be located in the central city, they also tend to be the oldest and most dilapidated schools in a school system. This physical condition contributes to white reluctance to be reassigned to these schools and probably encourages minorities to withdraw from them, when that option is present.

Evidence. The Massachusetts Research Center (1976) found that the newer the building, the less white flight. The qualitative research also supports this basic principle: the better the condition of the schools, the less flight. This is not to say, of course, that parents will not resist sending their children to new or renovated schools. Crain (1977) found better race relations in high schools in better physical condition, and Rossell (1977) found higher average daily attendance in schools in better physical condition. By themselves, however, good facilities will not substantially alter either white flight or educational quality.

Illustrative example. Madison High School in Boston is a magnet school in a minority neighborhood in Roxbury. The school, with its modern facilities, has been extraordinarily successful in attracting whites, even more so than many magnet schools in white neighborhoods.

In Areas Where Desegregation Will Not Occur in the Immediate Future, A Program of Voluntary Metropolitan Student Transfer Should be Instituted

A program permitting minority students to voluntarily transfer from central city to suburban schools has been used in some school districts with a considerable positive impact on minority achievement. The programs are normally supervised by the State Department of Education with transportation provided to minority volunteers who wish to attend suburban schools which agree to cooperate with the program.

Evidence. The summary of the achievement literature included in this report (cf. Volume V) notes that eleven evaluations have been done on such programs in the metropolitan areas of Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, Newark, Rochester, and Boston. Eight of the eleven evaluations show positive achievement results often of sizable magnitude. One study in Hartford finds that graduates of the program seemed to be more successful in pursuing careers. Some experts believe that a critical mass of students of a given race should be assured in each school participating in this program. Ideally that critical mass would be at least 15-20%.

Illustrative examples. The best known programs are in Connecticut (Hartford, particularly), Massachusetts (METCO in Boston), and Wisconsin, and the state legislation in Wisconsin and Massachusetts may be useful models for other areas.

Comments. It seems likely that a voluntary metropolitan program will encourage residential desegregation of suburbs receiving students, but no research has been done on this question to date. It should be noted that voluntary metropolitan programs cannot be considered adequate substitutes for desegregation programs, since they invariably leave the minority schools nearly as segregated as before.

Although these programs seem innocuous at first glance, they have in fact met with considerable political resistance, both from suburbs which resist desegregation and central cities which resist the loss of revenue resulting from the decline in enrollment. Orfield (1981) has suggested that such a program may be useful as a precursor to a metropolitan plan, since it introduces the suburban districts to desegregation and helps to develop interdistrict coordination.

Metropolitan Plans

Metropolitan plans are highly effective strategies for reducing racial and class isolation. A metropolitan plan is one whose scope includes the central city and the surrounding suburbs. This can be accomplished by merging a legally separate central city school district and the surrounding suburban school district(s) for the purposes of desegregation after the determination of a cross-district violation (as in Indianapolis-Marion County and Wilmington-New Castle County) or by ordering desegregation in a school district that is already metropolitan in scope (e.g., Charlotte-Mecklenburg, or Tampa-Hillsborough County).

Evidence. Coleman, Kelly and Moore (1975), Farley, Bianchi and Colosanto (1979), Armor (1980) and Rossell (1978a) all find that there is a higher level of interracial contact (proportion white in the average minority child's school) in metropolitan plans because the proportion white tends to be higher to begin with in a school system which includes suburbs, and because there is less white flight from metropolitan plans. The qualitative research as well as the interviews support this general principle.

Coleman et al. (1975), Farley et al. (1979), Armor (1980) and Rossell (1978a), as well as the qualitative writers and the interviewees, all conclude that metropolitan plans produce less white flight than central city plans. It is argued that this is because (1) moving out of the school district can be difficult or undesirable if the high status suburbs are already in the school district, and (2) the proportion minority will be lower than in central city school districts. This latter phenomenon has two effects: it minimizes white anxiety which tends to increase as the proportion minority increases and it also minimizes the proportion of whites who will have to be reassigned. Pearce (1980) finds that metropolitan school desegregation contributes to residential desegregation.

In addition, the qualitative research and the interviews suggest that metropolitan plans will produce greater socioeconomic integration and greater financial stability than central city plans since those who live in the suburbs tend to be of higher socioeconomic status than those who live in the city. It may also give state legislatures a greater stake in providing support to schools.

Illustrative examples. Putting aside county-wide school systems that predated desegregation, there are only a few metropolitan desegregation plans. These are: Wilmington-New Castle County, Delaware; Louisville-Jefferson County, Kentucky; and Indianapolis-Marion County, Indiana.

NOM Students Should be Considered as Distinct Groups

Often non-black minorities have been ignored, treated as blacks, or treated as whites in the design of desegregation plans. Not only should blacks, Hispanics, Asians/Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans be defined as discrete groups, but the educational needs of different subgroups need to be considered.

Evidence. The experts interviewed agreed with this general proposition, almost without exception. The research literature indicates that different racial groups have different types of experiences under desegregation (Gerard & Miller, 1975; Crain & Mahard, 1980; Dornbush & Fernandez, 1979). An obvious point to be made here is that the need for bilingual education among NOM students should not be assumed; it must be determined by systematic testing and teacher/parent assessment.

The Racial/Ethnic Composition of Schools

In drawing their pupil assignment plans, almost every school district faces the question of what the optimum racial and ethnic composition of particular schools should be. "Racial balance" is sometimes the solution to this question but because busing distances needed to achieve balance may be very great and because courts often have accepted the retention of some all-minority schools in districts with large minority populations, the issue is not settled by a racial balance criterion. The problem is, of course, that there are many goals that are taken into account in drawing a pupil assignment plan and different goals may have different implications for the racial and ethnic composition of schools. The following propositions appear to be considerations that should shape decisions about racial composition. There is no precise formula that we can offer that will allow these considerations to be "balanced out" in particular circumstances.

1. Different minority groups (e.g., blacks and Hispanics) should be treated differently and distinctly. Hispanics have sometimes been counted as blacks, and sometimes as whites, usually to minimize the busing of whites.
2. A "critical mass" of between 15-20% of any particular racial or ethnic group should be retained. In multi-race/ethnic schools, this minimum might be relaxed somewhat and the higher the socioeconomic status (SES) of the groups in question (e.g., blacks, whites, Hispanics), the less emphasis needs to be placed on the group's minimum size. A critical mass of students seems to encourage intergroup contact, discourage self-isolation, facilitate the responsiveness of teachers and administrators to the special needs of minorities--especially when remedial or bilingual programs are needed (see Comment below), and promote more parental involvement in the school.
3. In biracial/bi-ethnic situations, intergroup conflict may be greatest when the two groups are about equal in size. This

potential for conflict may be greatest when the students involved are of lower socioeconomic status.

4. White parents, and perhaps middle class minority parents, are more likely to leave or not enter the public schools if their children are bused (a) to schools in which their students are in the minority, especially in biracial/bi-ethnic situations, or (b) to schools in minority neighborhoods. There is some reason to believe that whites are more likely to flee when blacks are the dominant non-white group than when Hispanics are. Other things equal, the higher the socioeconomic status of whites, the more likely they are to flee from desegregation to suburban or private schools.
5. The maintenance of a critical mass of students who do relatively well academically seems to contribute not only to the achievement of these students but to students who have been lower achievers. Students seem to be influenced most by same race peers. The size of the necessary critical mass to promote achievement seems to depend on the achievement gaps involved and the way teachers organize their classes and relate to students (see section D-2 below).

Evidence. Each of the propositions cited above represents the consensus view of the experts interviewed. Longshore (1981) found that whites were most hostile to blacks in desegregated schools that were between 40-60% white. This hostility was most clear in low SES schools, large schools, rural schools and southern schools. Similar conclusions relating to proportion of blacks and white hostility are reached by St.

John (1975) and Bullock (1976). Thomas (1978) and Campbell (1977) both find more racial hostility in situations where whites are lower SES.

While the evidence is less than definitive on the question, the belief that schools should be at least 15-20% minority is widely held by experts in the field (cf. Koslin, Koslin & Pargament, 1972). Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981) found poor race relations and low black male achievement in newly desegregated southern high schools which were less than 20% black. That study also found achievement test scores and race relations generally good where blacks were in the majority although there was considerable evidence of white flight as well. All other studies of school racial composition and minority achievement have reported only a linear trend--the more white students in the school, the higher the minority achievement, though these findings seem more related to the achievement levels of whites in these schools than to race itself (see Hawley, 1981b).

Evidence supporting the proposition above related to white flight is reasonably clear and is summarized by Rossell and Hawley (1981).

There is considerable evidence that black and NOM students are less prejudiced and more responsive to race relations programs than are whites (System Development Corporation, 1980; Erbe, 1977; Regens & Bullock, 1979).

Comment. The generalizations offered above do not lend themselves to examples since the idea is to take all these considerations into account simultaneously. It is important to emphasize that there are many predominantly minority schools that attract and keep students of other races, that have good race relations, and where the academic performance of students is good.

One issue that continues to bedevil desegregation planners in cities with large numbers of students needing bilingual education is how desegregation and bilingual education can be accommodated. There is a growing literature on this topic (Fernandez & Guskin, 1981; Carter, 1979).

As noted above, the assignment of NOM children with limited English proficiency (LEP) during desegregation must be done so as to cluster sufficient numbers of students in any given classroom or school where special assistance (bilingual instruction or English-as-a-Second-Language programs) may be provided. The model most frequently employed to achieve this goal was first adopted in the Boston desegregation plan. In that case, lawyers for the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund recommended (and the Court approved) that children of limited English proficiency be clustered in groups of 20 per grade for three consecutive grades in any selected schools to which youngsters were bused in order for a viable program to exist. Schools selected to receive these students were ones with bilingual programs. The principle of clustering for instructional purposes (bona fide groupings under ESAA guidelines) established in Boston, was followed in other desegregation plans, such as the one developed as a result of the court order in Evans v. Buchanan, and has been incorporated in various cities (Detroit, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Kalamazoo) into Title VI ("Lau") compliance plans which have been accepted by the Office for Civil Rights. In effect, NOM children who were classified as LEP were accorded assignment priority, and other children (black and white) were assigned afterwards in accordance with majority/minority ratios and variances approved by the court.

A variation of this method is found when NOM-LEP students in a school with language assistance programs are allowed to remain in that school in order to continue receiving appropriate services. The plan submitted by the Detroit Public Schools in response to the 6th Circuit's 1980 order for additional desegregation between District #1 (predominantly black) and District #2 (significant numbers of NOM-LEP students) utilizes this approach.

Desegregation Plans Should Take Into Account the Socioeconomic Status of Students

Research has shown that one reason why desegregation improves minority student achievement is that students from economically deprived backgrounds benefit from attending school with students of higher income families. The reason for this finding may, however, have more to do with the achievement levels of students with higher SES than with SES *per se*, although teachers may behave differently where there are larger numbers of middle and upper class students and where the parents of these students make demands on the school.

This has several implications for school desegregation. First, middle class white students should be used as effectively as possible in a desegregation plan. Secondly, a desegregation plan should be drawn so as to provide a socioeconomically desegregated school for low-income whites. Low-income whites can benefit educationally in the same way that low-income minorities do from desegregation. Third, in situations where it is impossible to desegregate all minority students, the benefits of desegregation should go first to those from economically deprived backgrounds, assuming that their educational needs will be adequately met in the desegregated setting. As noted in the previous discussion of racial composition, racial conflict is likely to be greatest where the aggregate SES of the school is low, especially in biracial situations where two races are of approximate "strength." Fourth, the intellectual and interpersonal resources of higher SES NOM students should be tapped, particularly those who have received several years of schooling in their native country.

Evidence. The Coleman report (1966) first showed that most of the academic benefit of school desegregation to minorities was the result of the mixing of social classes (high status whites with low status minorities) rather than races. A lack of social class integration may reduce the benefits of desegregation. Charles Thomas (1979) concludes that desegregation involving low SES whites and minorities is more likely to lead to racial tensions than desegregation involving middle class whites and minorities. Bruce Campbell (1977) suggests that low SES whites are more prejudiced than higher SES whites, and when schools with SES mixes are compared, those with high white SES have less racial tension. While it is generally assumed that low-income students create more problems in desegregated schools, there is little evidence of this and one major study (Crain, Mahard & Narot, 1981) found the exact opposite—that racial tensions in southern high schools were more serious when the minority students were middle class rather than poor. There is considerable literature which indicates that low-income white students are more likely to have higher achievement and to attend college if they are in school with more high-income whites, although not all research shows this pattern.

As noted above, desegregation with higher income white students will generally lead to better race relations in schools, but we can also expect greater white flight when the families being desegregated have the means to enroll their students in private schools (see Rossell, 1979; Giles, Gatlin & Cataldo, 1976).

Illustrative examples. Most school systems have not explicitly utilized SES as a criterion, though Pasadena proposed to factor in SES in its desegregation plan in order to achieve SES as well as racial and ethnic balance. In Los Angeles, the plan had the effect of increasing the separation of socioeconomic status because schools were allowed to pair themselves in the first step of desegregation and the board felt that integrating whites with more middle class minorities would reduce white flight. In the view of the staff of the Louisville-Jefferson County schools, the least successful schools in the desegregation plan are the schools which serve low-income blacks and low-income whites; achievement test scores are low for both the whites and the blacks in these schools.

The Issue of Busing Distance

Two of the central issues in almost all desegregation suits and in all planning efforts are: (a) what is the maximum amount of time a student should be on the bus? and (b) how many miles should the longest bus ride be? These two questions are related, of course.

If any argument is to be made about the effects that riding the bus has on students, it would have to center on the time involved. Parents, however, may be equally or more concerned with distance, perhaps because they *feel* that they could not respond to an emergency the child had at a school "across town."

There is virtually no evidence that riding the bus has a negative impact on students. Studies that have addressed this concern generally indicate that busing itself has no adverse effects on learning. James Davis (1973, p. 119), after looking at data from a large number of desegregated southern school districts, concludes that "there is no evidence that busing *per se* . . . (or) attending one's own neighborhood school has any effects, positive or negative, on school achievement or social climate." Natkin (1980) studied the effects of busing on desegregated second grade students in Jefferson County (Louisville) during the 1978-79 school year. He found no impact of busing on the scores of either black or white students. Barbara Zoloth (1976) examined data on the effects on children of the amount of time spent riding the bus and concludes that it has no relationship to achievement. The National Safety Council reports that riding the bus is safer for students than walking to school. To be sure, some desegregation plans require some students to spend considerably more time getting to school than they did before desegregation. It seems reasonable to assume that riding buses for extended periods of time would be tiring and would take children away from other activities from which they could benefit, and this possibility warrants further study.

There is some research on the relationship between busing distance and white flight. Unfortunately, the evidence is mixed. Rossell (1980) argues that while busing distance has no effect on white flight once a district is initially desegregated, parents whose children face a long bus ride are more likely not to participate in desegregation in the first year. But the evidence on this point is limited.

Not surprisingly, all experts agree that busing distances should be kept "as short as possible." Of course, the shorter the bus rides in most cities, the less racial isolation can be reduced. In short, this issue is of considerable importance but neither the research nor the experts agree on what the maximum time or distance of a bus ride for school children should be.

Who Should be Desegregated? Which National Origin Minorities are Racially Isolated?

Desegregating school districts with large numbers of NOM students face the question: should all NOM students be treated as minorities whose needs are taken into special account in the pupil assignment plan? Many of the experts interviewed raised this question both because desegregation may place some NOM families in a position that is inappropriate and because some school systems have "desegregated" NOM students of certain backgrounds while leaving others isolated.

There is no empirical answer to this question, but the relevant opinions of experts and the views of the study team itself, suggest that the principle involved here is, simply, persons should not be desegregated who are not segregated. This proposition, of course, raises another issue: how does one decide who is segregated?

The answer to that question seems to depend on the answer to several others:

1. Are the students severely deficient in English?
2. Has the group of students been, and is now, the victim of discrimination by public officials?
3. Are the students involved residentially desegregated?
4. Is the income level of the students above the district (or regional) average?

These criteria do not, of course, solve the problem but they do draw attention to the fact that the educational and social needs of NOM students differ substantially and should be treated uniquely by the desegregation plan. Such considerations, in turn, draw attention to the need to ask: what are the goals we are trying to achieve through the desegregation of NOM students?

Using School Desegregation to Effect Housing Desegregation

It has long been known that housing segregation creates segregated schools, and it has been contended in various court suits that the reverse is also true--segregated schools create housing segregation. Now there is some evidence which indicates that school desegregation can promote housing desegregation. This can happen for three reasons. First, when a school district is desegregated there is no pressure for whites with young children to move out of racially mixed neighborhoods since the school administration has guaranteed racial stability. Secondly, any family, white or minority, can move anywhere in the school district knowing that their child will not be the only one of his or her race in the school. Third, school desegregation makes racial steering by real estate agents more difficult since they can no longer use the neighborhood school as a guide to the neighborhood's prestige, nor can they intimidate whites by arguing that certain neighborhoods have schools of inferior quality based on racial composition.

The most systematic study of the relationship between school desegregation and housing desegregation is Pearce's (1980) exploratory analysis of the degree of change in residential racial balance in seven matched pairs of school districts from 1970-75 showing the desegregated school districts to have substantially greater reductions in the residential segregation of blacks and whites than the segregated school districts. (Of the few cities with sizable Hispanic population that were studied, only in Riverside did there appear to be a relationship between residential and school desegregation.) It appears that in areas where the desegregation plan is broadest in scope, residential desegregation tends to be even greater. Moreover, this effect is not limited to the first few years of desegregation, but continues at least into the second decade (Pearce, 1980, p. 35). Although this is the only quantitative research on the issue, there is a wealth of relevant experience in desegregated communities which can be drawn upon in developing policy recommendations.

School Desegregation Plans Should be Designed so as to Preserve Integrated and Racially Changing Neighborhoods

One major factor which stabilized residential neighborhoods is the traditional neighborhood school pattern. With neighborhood schools, it often happens that a small in-migration of minority residents into an all-white neighborhood creates a school with a disproportionately large minority enrollment, which serves to accelerate white flight from the neighborhood and leads to both a segregated school and shortly thereafter a segregated neighborhood. The right kind of desegregation plan can have the opposite effect—slowing the process of racial change and encouraging residential integration. The ideal desegregation plan for this purpose should have the following components:

1. The desegregation plan should be based on accurate projections of racial composition for several years in advance, rather than using existing figures which may be out of date before the plan is implemented. In particular, projected increases in Asian and Hispanic populations, especially in urban centers, should be taken into consideration by relocation planners.
2. Mixed and changing neighborhood schools should be designated as schools where students will not be bused out. In many cities, the whites in these neighborhoods are bused in one direction in order to desegregate a ghetto school while minorities are bused in the opposite direction to further desegregation in a white

neighborhood. This is an invariable consequence when a computer program is used to minimize the total amount of transportation. Instead these schools should be designated as exempt from busing. This exemption is important because it "counteracts negative market tendencies and reinforces positive individual inclinations" (Pearce, 1980, p. 42).

3. These neighborhood schools should also be given guarantees of racial stability in the schools through a provision to expand facilities with portables, through annual adjustment of attendance boundaries where this is helpful, and through the promise of busing-in white or minority students as needed to supplement the racial enrollment. Since this means one-way busing for the whites or minorities brought into the area, they should be drawn from nearby areas so that busing times will be short and there will be a tendency for the sending and receiving neighborhoods to recognize that they have a common interest in residential stability.
4. Integrated schools should not be exempted if they are integrated, not by a racially mixed neighborhood, but by the voluntary transfer in of minority students as was done in Los Angeles. This provides no incentive to neighborhood desegregation and increases the busing distance of others.
5. Adjoining segregated neighborhoods can be placed in the same attendance zone to create a no-bus "integrated" neighborhood as long as there is some reasonable chance that whites will be willing to move into the minority area and minorities into the white

area sometime in the future so as to make it truly residentially integrated.

Illustrative examples. In Stockton, neighborhood attendance zones were examined, and redrawn where necessary to create schools which would then be exempt from busing. As a result, Stockton experienced white flight in two directions: out of the school district into the central city where the integrated neighborhoods existed.

The highly segregated Philadelphia school system has done some interesting things to maintain racially mixed neighborhoods, including creating a small twelve-grade 50% black school serving a pocket of whites surrounded by a large ghetto, and constructing magnet schools to serve racially mixed neighborhoods. Baltimore, another highly segregated school district, has established middle schools to maintain racially mixed neighborhoods. In Louisville, integrated neighborhoods are exempt from busing and the local fair housing organization has vigorously promoted living in these areas as an alternative to busing.

School Desegregation Plans Should Provide Incentives to Segregated Neighborhoods to Desegregate

Rarely is any neighborhood, particularly a white neighborhood, able to establish a collective will to encourage opposite-race families to move in, although there are some examples in Oak Park, Illinois, and Shaker Heights, Ohio, where white neighborhoods have worked to attract blacks in order to decrease the pressure of black in-migration on adjoining neighborhoods in danger of becoming segregated. A school desegregation plan can encourage racial desegregation of housing by providing incentives to neighborhoods which receive opposite-race in-migrants. One important incentive would be to exempt the area from busing as soon as it reaches a certain level of racial integration. An effective desegregation plan would ideally include coordination with other city agencies in helping to provide information to these neighborhoods and organize them politically so that they can work to attract minorities, or alternatively, to accept scattered-site public housing or use Section 8 subsidies to relocate them.

Illustrative examples. The St. Louis desegregation plan provides that the students in any formerly white neighborhood with a 20% resident school enrollment are exempt from being bused out. In Louisville-Jefferson County, the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights (1975) publicized those neighborhoods blacks could move into and be exempted from busing because they were integrating the attendance zone. As a result, blacks have moved into suburban Jefferson County and many white neighborhoods have begun actively recruiting them. In Wichita, white students are bused based on a birth-date lottery, unless they live in an integrated neighborhood.

School Desegregation Plans Should Provide Incentives to Encourage Individuals to Move into Communities Predominantly of the Opposite Race

A segregated neighborhood school assignment policy provides major costs to minority or white families who are considering the possibility of moving into an area occupied predominantly by the opposite race. Persons who do so are confronted with the fact that their children will be placed in an environment made up largely or entirely of opposite-race students. A school desegregation plan eliminates this cost, but provides no positive incentives.

One incentive to induce individuals to move into opposite-race neighborhoods is to guarantee that these students will not be bused, except if the family desires it, even if they do not constitute a large enough group to create an integrated school. This is difficult to do if a grade reorganization system is used such that all elementary school students attend grade five in minority areas and grades one through four in white areas (a typical desegregation plan in communities whose schools are 20% black). Then the student who lives in a particular neighborhood will have to ride the bus along with his/her neighbors regardless of his/her color. Since most plans where whites are a majority bus students from white neighborhoods, minorities still have an incentive to move into white areas under a total grade reorganization plan. There is a disincentive for whites to move into predominantly minority areas, however, since they will find their child being bused for more years than if they had stayed in their white neighborhood.

One way to ensure that individuals who have desegregated neighborhoods are not bused and yet still maintain racial balance in the school system is to establish magnet schools throughout minority neighborhoods and provide a guaranteed seat in these schools for white families who have moved into these neighborhoods.

In most districts, locating magnet schools in white neighborhoods is not as useful as placing them in minority neighborhoods. This is partly because the minorities in white neighborhoods would experience less busing than whites in minority neighborhoods and partly because the magnet schools in white neighborhoods would serve as a haven for whites who resist being reassigned to ghetto area schools.

A supplementary strategy for ensuring no busing for those who move into one-race neighborhoods is to design a plan which reassigns only a portion of each grade, leaving a full range of grades in both minority and white neighborhoods. Under these conditions, there will be a neighborhood or nearby school serving the minority students in white areas at every grade level and a similar school for whites in minority neighborhoods. The family moving into the opposite race neighborhood then has the option of staying in their neighborhood for all grades or being bused out. These desegregation strategies should ultimately reduce the amount of busing.

Illustrative examples. In Louisville-Jefferson County, any students moving into an area where they are a racial minority are immediately exempt from busing (Kentucky Commission on Human Rights, 1980). In Wichita, black students are bused according to their address and if they move out of a predominantly black area, they are exempt (Pearce, 1980, pp. 42-43).

School Desegregation Plans Should Include the Creation of a School District Office Concerned with Eliminating Housing Segregation

Since eliminating housing segregation eliminates the need for busing, it would seem to be to the advantage of a school district to be concerned with housing. However, school district administrators are educational experts rather than experts in housing. There does not appear to be a school district which has the expertise to systematically attack the housing issue (although Riverside comes close). To foster integrated housing, school districts should establish an office explicitly concerned with this problem. This office would have six major functions:

1. Prepare policy analysis and policy recommendations for the school board and for publicizing the school board's position.
2. Develop an overall plan of housing patterns, either by its own staff or by local housing agencies. Such a plan would attempt to project the pattern of residential movement of minorities and whites into the future and thereby identify areas which are

likely to be good targets for the school district's efforts, either to prevent resegregation or to introduce integration.

3. Coordinate the school district's efforts with other agencies and lobby for effective policies which would help the school system. Examples of coordination might include making decisions jointly with the housing department about the siting of magnet schools to develop new residential areas. The school district might also be able to encourage local public housing agencies to locate public housing so as to reduce the need for busing; or the school district might review all proposed private subdivision developments in order to minimize their adverse effect on school desegregation.
4. Advise the school district on the best use of its real estate parcels. Many school districts own land originally purchased for school construction and which is no longer needed for school plants. The wise disposal of this land in such a manner as to further housing integration would obviously be very useful.
5. Through its own staff, or the staff from another city agency, ensure that counseling services are provided to families. This is especially important for families eligible for Section 8 subsidies who would benefit from making a desegregating move, but who might be quite unfamiliar with opportunities available to them. The counseling office could also provide useful services to white families returning to the city. Of particular interest would be counseling services provided for teachers who are often assigned to schools in opposite-race neighborhoods as a result of desegregation and who might wish to live closer to their work.

6. Provide liaison services, in some cases, with neighborhood improvement groups. Such groups may be able to organize a drive to exempt their neighborhood from busing by recruiting opposite-race residents or subsidized housing. The latter could be either new construction or subsidies applied to existing buildings. An organizer and technical assistance person might be very helpful to these neighborhoods.

The office should be staffed by someone who has proven expertise and experience in the housing and real estate field and a commitment to school desegregation, and it should be served by an advisory board of persons who bring expertise, influence, and channels of communication to other government and private agencies.

Illustrative examples. The Riverside Unified School District has been performing many of these tasks for the last ten years and as a result all but four schools are integrated by the neighborhood attendance zone.

The Jefferson County, Kentucky housing authority figures show 722 of the 1413 black families who signed Section 8 leases since 1975 moved into white suburban Jefferson County (still part of the Louisville-Jefferson County school district). This was possible only after the merger of the separate city and county agencies into one office which counseled families and coordinated their moves. While not part of the school system in Louisville, this activity is one school systems could promote or facilitate.

Local Housing Agencies Should Encourage Scattered Site Housing

One way to desegregate housing is to locate subsidized housing units likely to serve minority persons in segregated neighborhoods. Each site should be relatively small and sites should be scattered throughout the school district. Desegregation plans, in turn, can take these housing programs into account.

Illustrative examples. In Charlotte, North Carolina, the Community Relations Commission worked with real estate brokers and housing officials to encourage predominantly white neighborhoods to accept scattered site housing. The community was receptive to the idea because these neighborhoods would then be exempt from busing. Interviewees in Denver, Minneapolis and Seattle report that scattered site housing was employed to further school desegregation.

School Desegregation Plans Should Include Local and Federal Housing Agencies as Parties

A number of cases have shown that federal and local housing policies have furthered segregation of neighborhoods and hence segregation of schools. It follows logically that a desegregation remedy should include these actors as well. The requirement that subsidized housing be located so as to further desegregation is one obvious way in which housing agencies, both local and federal, can share in creating a desegregated school system.

Illustrative examples. The two most significant cases in this regard are those in St. Louis and Yonkers, New York.

Community Preparation and Involvement

Between the time the court order comes down and the time school desegregation is actually implemented, the school district has an opportunity to prepare parents and the community for desegregation to ensure that it will be implemented smoothly and work well. In most cases this opportunity is not well used.

The fears of parents of violence in the schools, of the unknown, and of losing control of their children's lives have important effects on their behavior and, ultimately, on the outcome of desegregation. It is up to the school district and the political and business leadership to deal with these anxieties if desegregation is to be successful. Yet typically the school district ignores parents and community groups, the mass media exacerbates their fears by covering white flight and protest, and the business and political leadership remain silent.

Post-implementation parental involvement in the schools may ultimately be as important as pre-desegregation involvement if it gives parents the feeling that they have some control over their children's education and their future. Many administrators and teachers, however, see education as a professional matter in which laymen should not intervene. When the context is a highly charged political issue such as school desegregation, that kind of attitude may only create more problems for the school district.

In Presenting their Views to the Community, Proponents of Desegregation Should Emphasize the Educational Programs that Will be Available as a Result of the Court Order or School Board Action

One of the peculiarities of school desegregation litigation is that it is one of the very rare cases where a defendant is found guilty of a violation of the law and is ordered to take an action which is not a punishment or a cost. A court trial is ordinarily a zero-sum game; what one party gains, the other loses. In civil cases, the guilty defendant is required to pay damages; in criminal cases, he pays a fine or is imprisoned. It is thus only natural for the white community to assume that if it has been found guilty of segregation, desegregation is the punishment. Proponents of desegregation do not like to debate whether desegregation is beneficial or not and will often reply to such an argument by simply pointing out the constitutional mandate for the elimination of illegal segregation. Doing so, however, only feeds the anxieties of the white community by stressing the fact that they have been found guilty and implying that they should be punished. For this reason, it is important to stress that desegregation of schools does not harm white children, and that it is an opportunity, not a punishment.

Perhaps because demands for desegregation usually come from minority groups, school officials often fail to provide minority parents with information about the potential benefits of desegregation. For example, Hispanic parents need to be assured that bilingual and other special programs can and should be part of desegregation plans.

Evidence. There is no research on this question in the context of desegregation but research on political attitudes and conflict resolution illuminates the way in which zero-sum thinking dominates public attitudes about policy making.

Several experts interviewed stressed the importance of conveying positive changes from desegregation rather than justifying desegregation in terms of the past wrongs done to minorities. Hawley (1981b) cites theory and studies suggesting that, under some conditions, school desegregation creates opportunities for introducing new programs. Noboa (1980) shows that desegregated school systems are more likely to offer bilingual programs than are those that are predominantly of one race or ethnic group.

Illustrative examples. Desegregation in Boston led to the introduction of numerous new programs that created opportunities for both black and white students (Kozol, 1980).

Positive Media Coverage

Since the greatest white flight occurs in most school districts in the year of implementation, those who have fled are people who have never tried desegregation. Typically, these individuals do not know anyone who has experienced desegregated schools, yet they believe their children's education will suffer when their schools are desegregated. The question is, from what source do they get their information? In most cases, the answer is the mass media, directly or indirectly.

This is also true after school desegregation. Few parents have contact with any more than a few other parents and so rely on the mass media to tell them how school desegregation is faring, what kind of education their children are receiving, and particularly what kinds of disturbances and racial tensions exist in a community. The mass media thus can have a substantial impact on the climate of opinion in a community and in so doing on the outcomes of desegregation.

Because the mass media serves as the source of information on the costs, benefits, and risks of school desegregation, it is important that some agency provide the newspapers and television with positive stories on desegregation and positive evidence on school performance, both before and after desegregation and with press releases about new and innovative school programs. This is a full-time job which requires someone skilled in public information and marketing. While the school district might be willing to undertake such a job after school desegregation is implemented, it is unlikely they will do so before implementation. During this time period some other agency, perhaps in the state government, will have to do it.

In districts with national origin minorities, care should be taken to use the language and media of the NOM group whenever possible, and to emphasize the interrelationships among civil rights initiatives resulting in race desegregation and those leading to bilingual education programs.

States can also play an important role in facilitating positive media coverage by collecting information about desegregation in their states and providing this information to the media.

Evidence. Although the media have a liberal reputation among those opposed to busing, researchers who have done content analyses (Rossell, 1978b; Stuart, 1973; Cunningham & Husk, 1979) find the press tends to emphasize anti-busing protest, white flight, and interracial conflict as a product of desegregation. In addition, this negative coverage is correlated with white flight (Rossell, 1978b) and with negative parental attitudes toward desegregation (Allen & Sears, 1978).

Illustrative examples. One important activity the school district can initiate during the pre-desegregation period which will not make them look like they are "pro-desegregation," but which almost always results in positive media coverage, are organized bus trips for white parents to visit minority schools. This was perhaps the only positive coverage of desegregation in Los Angeles during the pre-desegregation year. The L.A. Times extensively quoted the white parents who went on these trips as to how much better the schools were than they expected, how learning was actually going on, and how the distance did not seem that long when someone else was doing the driving.

The superintendent of the Charlotte system said he could not have accomplished what has been done without the cooperation of a supportive media--both in print and the electronic media. In that city, there was live TV coverage of discussions of the desegregation plan. In New Castle County, Delaware, and Louisville, Kentucky, well-planned efforts to cultivate a positive relationship with the media have been undertaken. In New Castle County, private industry helped with the needed effort. In Louisville, "self-censorship" agreements were worked out with local newspapers.

In Columbus, a citizen's group worked closely with the schools and the media to provide reporters with information and news sources.

In Massachusetts, the state education agency has contracted with the University of Massachusetts to collect information about desegregation in that state and elsewhere and to provide that information to the agency for dissemination to the media.

Parents Should be Provided with Clear and Full Information about the Desegregation Plan and Its Implementation

School systems cannot depend on the media to inform parents about desegregation nor will community-wide committees serve as a vehicle for communicating with parents. Thus, school districts should develop ways of informing parents about desegregation and should develop written understandable, upbeat materials that spell out the details of the plan, its rationale, and the nature of the services students will receive. The best approach may be to emphasize the quality of the schools students will be attending at the same time that the logistics of the pupil assignment plan are spelled out. In systems with limited English speaking populations, information should be provided in the native language of those persons. "Walk-in" parent meetings should be held in neighborhoods. Teachers can be the best sources of information and might be encouraged to visit parents in their homes. School-level committees, perhaps supplementing PTA organizations, can serve important communication functions. We discuss this approach in section D-2 below.

Evidence. This proposition is agreed to by almost all the experts interviewed. Particular emphasis was placed by these experts on the need to communicate to minorities what the purposes of the plan are and what services will be available. Many school systems seem to assume that minority populations, especially blacks, support the desegregation effort. Confusion about the details of the plan seem to increase opposition to desegregation (Allen & Sears, 1978).

Supportive Community Leadership

Encouraging local and neighborhood leaders to play a more positive role in desegregation controversies can be an effective strategy for influencing positive public reaction to desegregation. Leaders of the same race and ethnicity as the persons they hope to influence will be most effective.

Evidence. There is no empirical evidence that community-wide leadership has any influence on white flight and protest (except indirectly by contributing to the slant of newspaper and media coverage) (see Rossell, 1978b).

This may be because desegregation is an issue area where there often is no leadership from city officials or business leaders when the desegregation plan calls for substantial reassignment of students. The evidence suggests that if leadership activity is to be successful in minimizing negative reactions, the activity should be at the neighborhood level (see Hayes, 1977; Taylor & Stinchcombe, 1977) or from religious and social groups in which the individuals influenced are members. Thus, while it is clearly desirable to have community-wide leaders endorsing desegregation, announcements from afar about the need to obey the law may not be sufficient when anti-busing leaders are actively influencing opinion and behavior at the grass roots level. It is important to constrain protest since the available research suggests that protest demonstrations exacerbate white flight (Rossell, 1978b).

Behind-the-scenes activity in which various groups are bought off, blackmailed, or cajoled into acquiescence or even support may, however, be influential in shaping behavior. On the basis of experiences in Boston, Louisville and elsewhere, political leaders who build their careers on their opposition to desegregation may not last long after the desegregation plan is implemented. The case evidence suggests that opposition to busing is usually a source of only short-term glory.

Illustrative examples. The Catholic hierarchy, for example, can be influential in announcing that their schools will not serve as a haven for those fleeing desegregation. In Cleveland and Milwaukee, the Catholic hierarchy has taken this position with the support of most nuns and priests. If the rule is enforced, it can have a significant impact on reducing white flight and perhaps improving the legitimacy of desegregation.

Establishing Multiethnic Citizen-Parent-Teacher-Student Committees to Assist in Planning and Implementing the Desegregation Process

Many school districts have formed broad-based citizens' committees to work with school district personnel in designing the desegregation plan. These committees typically represent all major racial and ethnic groups, parents, and educational, business, and political leaders, and they are usually system-wide. Their authority can vary from having a formal veto power (highly unusual) to being an informal advisory group. The major purpose of these committees is to maximize the acceptability of the plan, given the constraints imposed by a court or other governmental agency, to the community. The range of issues in which such committees are involved also varies but usually such a pre-implementation group examines plan details, and assists in designing and developing the implementation procedures such as pre-desegregation school visits or establishing and operating crisis information centers.

Such committees should equally represent all racial and ethnic groups (even if that means they represent a disproportionate percentage of the population) and all elements of the community. Where more than one national origin minority group resides, separate meetings and committees should be established by language group, to ensure maximum parent participation and accurate dissemination of information. The committee that serves to facilitate initial desegregation may not be appropriate to the implementation of the plan, depending on how the committee is formed. One difference might be the relative role of parents and it seems desirable to find some way to select parents that will ensure that they represent the views of other parents. School-level parent involvement is also important and that strategy is discussed in the section of this report on structural and curricular changes in desegregated schools (see pp. 81-130).

Evidence. While there is no hard evidence supporting the efficacy of these committees in increasing community acceptance or reducing white flight and protest, the experts interviewed agreed that such committees are important to effective desegregation. The qualitative literature supports pre- and post-implementation strategies calling for parent involvement in planning and monitoring school desegregation to avoid resegregation. Miller (1975), Arnez (1978), Demarest and Jordan (1975), Wright (1973) and Hall (1979) each call for more community involvement to prevent resegregation resulting from disproportionate minority suspensions or "pushout" practices.

One study of school officials from throughout the southwest (Murphy, 1980), cites this strategy as a mechanism for reducing resegregation. Experts seemed to agree that while non-parent citizens can play important roles in such committees prior to the implementation of desegregation, once the initial steps have been taken the role of parents should be increased.

Illustrative examples. School officials in Tampa and Riverside believe the existence of these committees was critical in minimizing protest prior to desegregation and ensuring peaceful implementation. This in turn tends to reduce white flight. It is important that such committees work closely with the school administration and have their cooperation. In Los Angeles, the citizens' committee was appointed by the court and had an adversarial relationship with the school administration and their plans were rejected. This experience suggests that in planning stages, these committees should probably be appointed by the school district.

One example of the type of problems that can be avoided by the effective involvement of minority parents is suggested by Milwaukee's experience. In that city, notices to parents specifying options about schools and/or programs to choose from were sent out in English with no translation provided until after the deadline for submission of choices. As a result, many Hispanic parents exercised no choice for their schoolchildren. Some redress did eventually occur, but the active involvement of Hispanic parents could have prevented this situation.

Community Preparation Before Desegregation Should Include the Maximum Number of Parent Visits to Other-Race Schools

Parents whose children are reassigned in a desegregation plan normally know nothing about the school to which their child has been transferred. In this situation, irrational fears based on media-influenced stereotypes will take hold. A key element of community preparation might be a pattern of exchange visits between schools. The parent fact-finding committee can do some of the work, but all parents should be involved in visits to the new school.

One successful type of visit takes the form of an "open house" when staff and parents in one school play host to the other with a celebration atmosphere of cakes and cookies accompanying visits to the classroom. As noted above, these visits also provide the material for positive media coverage of desegregation.

Evidence. There is considerable agreement among experts interviewed and in the qualitative literature that supports the idea that these visitation programs are useful in gaining acceptance of desegregation.

Illustrative examples. Such visits were very successful in Los Angeles in the schools where they were held. The past chairman of the Human

Relations Advisory Council in New Castle County reported how several Sunday Open House activities in all schools allayed the fears of white parents regarding the school facility in black neighborhoods while reducing black parents' fear of racism. In Denver a series of picnics and home visits were held which reportedly involved more than 100,000 people. In Louisville and Cleveland some parents rode the buses to the schools their children were to attend in distant neighborhoods and reported back to parents in their neighborhoods. Both Columbus and Dayton ran summer orientation programs for parents.

Maintaining Contacts with Parents who have Withdrawn their Children

In many communities, most of those who leave the public schools to avoid desegregation do not move out of the school district (see Lord, 1975; McConahay & Hawley, 1978; Cunningham, Husk & Johnson, 1978; Orfield, 1978; Estabrook, 1980). School systems should maintain contact with these parents, identify their concerns, and provide them with programs and information that might attract them back to the public schools. Parentteacher-student associations can play a major role in such recruitment efforts, but the school district should take responsibility for this purpose.

School districts might also try to attract parents back to the school system, and keep those already there, by creating all-day schools which will serve a child care function before and after school until the parent comes home from work. Such schools could be much more attractive to working parents than a private school where their child has to be transported in the middle of the work day to after-school day care.

Evidence. There is no evidence that this effort would be successful although there is evidence that many school districts experience less than normal white enrollment declines in the fourth and fifth post-implementation years (Coleman, Kelly & Moore 1975; Rossell, 1978a). This suggests there are parents willing to return to the public school system. The interviews of personnel in county-wide school systems also indicate that there are white parents returning to the public school system.

Illustrative examples. Little Rock, Arkansas runs day-care centers in its school system. Public school parents in Little Rock, Nashville and Charlotte have put together materials, invited private school parents and parents of pre-school children to the schools, and have carried on recruitment activities. The teacher's organization has launched a public relations effort including advertisements on buses. These "bring-em-back-alive" activities, however, are usually run by parents. School systems have not seen themselves in the business of marketing their product.

Organizing at the District Level for Continuing Implementation

Most of the literature and debate about school desegregation is focused on the pupil assignment plan and community preparation strategies on the one hand, and school level policies and activities on the other. How districts should organize so as to best promote desegregation receives little discussion despite some recognition by experts that this can make or break the implementation of the plan. Of course, many of the strategies discussed here have implications for what the district should do, that is, what things it should encourage and support, but there is little concern for how the governance and administrative systems should be structured.

In this section, we briefly present a number of ideas that, for the most part, are gleaned from interviews and the observations of the study group itself. While there is no real evidence, aside from a relatively lengthy discussion of monitoring commissions, that these proposals are effective, it seems obvious that district-level organizational structures will affect the success of desegregation plans.

Organization of Essential Administrative Functions

As it does for school-level administrators and teachers, school desegregation places new demands on district-level administration. If no effort is made to establish a discrete administrative capability responsible for fostering effective desegregation, it is unlikely that the opportunities created by desegregation will be realized, or that the problems it introduces will be dealt with adequately. But, establishing a separate office for desegregation may reinforce propensities to see desegregation as something apart from the central functions and activities of the district. This in turn may lead to failures to adapt to desegregation and to coordinate the full resources of the district in ways that break down the false dichotomy between educational equity and educational quality.

The answer to this dilemma seems to be to establish a small, professionally staffed unit in the superintendent's office with the responsibility to enhance the motivation and capability of the operating agencies that administer the central functions of the district. If there is resistance to desegregation within the administration, it will not be overcome for long, if at all, by "going over the heads" of key administrators. An example of how such an office would operate is that it would work with the administrator(s) responsible for curriculum to make human relations objectives an integral and well-integrated element of the learning activities for all subjects. (For a discussion of human relations strategies, see the following section of this report.)

Of course some districts may be so recalcitrant that judges or state agencies find it necessary to displace all or some of the authority of the superintendent by establishing a "desegregation czar" and an operational office. An example of this approach is Cleveland's Office of Desegregation Implementation. But the very concept of a "czar" raises questions about the viability of this technique and it should be seen as a last resort.

In addition to fostering the attainment of human relations objectives through the "regular" curriculum, there appear to be some special desegregation-related needs of the system that this unit can address through technical assistance or the identification of external expertise and resources. These include:

1. Facilitating linkages between various special education programs whose coordination, which is always difficult, is often exacerbated by desegregation.
2. Coordinating and enriching the inservice training program. This should not lead to centrally developed inservice training (see pp. 131-171 below) but it could result in the better use of external resources, such as those available through State Agencies, and the identification of individuals and programs within the district that can be helpful to others.
3. Encouraging expertise in financial management and full deployment of external resources (cf. Colton & Berg, 1981).
4. Facilitating community and staff review of instructional materials and patterns of participation in extracurricular and elective offerings, in order to eliminate biased presentations and to ensure inclusion of relevant minority contributions.
5. Conducting formative program evaluations. It is important to the capacity of the school system that principals and teachers, as well as parents, be provided with information about how well the process in general is proceeding and about the effectiveness of particular programs. Schools can learn from each other's experience but only if the district works at it. Evaluations should treat the different racial and ethnic groups in the district as distinct populations.

This office might be the unit with which the district's housing expert is affiliated (see pp. 57-59 above).

Establishing Mechanisms for Monitoring Compliance and Effective Implementation

If there were not serious problems of commitment to desegregation within the school system, there would be no need for the court and state agency actions that usually motivate comprehensive desegregation plans. Thus, the desegregation process will be expedited in most districts by some type of monitoring committee. It seems important, however, that systems realize the incongruity of the watchdog functions of such a committee and the facilitative, supportive functions of the administrative desegregation unit proposed above. Placing these two different types of roles in the same agency will probably result in neither being performed very well.

Many court orders have specified that a citizen's committee monitor the operation of the desegregation plan. The primary function of a monitoring group is to provide information about the degree of compliance with the remedy order--primarily to the courts or civil rights agency ordering the remedy, but secondarily to the public in general and to the schools. Formally, the responsibility of monitoring committees is to verify for the court that the order is being met. In practice, they have proved useful in identifying a wide range of education problems that arise in the desegregated school district and in many cases this has led school systems to act to resolve the problems involved. A monitoring committee, which school districts themselves might establish, can assist desegregation by helping create a climate of public opinion which is concerned with school quality rather than with debates about the merits of busing.

Hochschild and Hadrick (1980) have analyzed a number of monitoring groups. In addition to the more obvious conditions which determine these groups' effectiveness, such as leadership, commitment, organization and funding, Hochschild and Hadrick's analysis reveals that differences in mandate, strategy and purpose have a great impact on the viability and success of these groups.

Illustrative examples. Denver's Community Education Council (CEC) is one of the most successful and influencial monitoring commissions. Initially, the mandate to the CEC was unclear, but eventually the Council was given the power to see all district proposals which would have an impact on the system's desegregation efforts, and it received quasi-party status in the courts. This degree of autonomy appears to have been a crucial factor in the Council's effectiveness. In contrast, it appears that the difficulties of the Los Angeles Monitoring Committee stem in large part from the ambiguity of the court's mandate for the committee (King, 1980; Hochschild & Hadrick, 1980). Community members recruited for participation in subcommittees eventually lost interest because there was no clear understanding of the function or role of the group.

There seem to be two distinct approaches to the monitoring process: system-wide research and analysis on the one hand, and specific problem-solving on the other. The Denver CEC is organized around complaint resolution and has succeeded in effecting several programmatic changes, such as getting Judge Doyle to order activity buses for children who want to participate in extracurricular activities. Its quasi-party status allows it to participate as well in long-range planning, as it has petitioned the court for hearings on affirmative action, inservice training and pupil assignment. The Tri-Ethnic Committee in Dallas is structured around individual complaint resolution and has succeeded in achieving the institution of a uniform discipline system which provides a three-party hearing for students charged with infractions of disciplinary codes.

The monitoring groups in Portland and Boston are examples of the systemic approach to overseeing desegregation implementation. Basing many of its recommendations to the court on public forums, questionnaires, and the results of national research, the Community Coalition for School Integration in Portland helped develop the Comprehensive Desegregation Plan which was submitted to the School Board in April 1980.

The Office of School Monitoring and Community Relations (OSMCR) in Cleveland provides a good example of how monitoring groups can build community support for school desegregation. The strategy behind OSMCR is data collection rather than complaint solicitation, and the organization apparently has succeeded in providing extensive information to the community that has helped to reverse the trend of stiff community opposition and resistance to desegregation.

Some monitoring groups have been able to work with the media to ensure accurate and fair coverage of desegregation issues. This positive relationship was cultivated, for example, in Cleveland, due to the efforts of OSMCR's full time press secretary who had previously been a journalist.

Involving Teachers and Principals in the Development of Desegregation-Related Policies

It seems safe to say that the most important determinants of effective school desegregation are the commitment of teachers and principals to the plan and the capability of school-level personnel to implement it and to go beyond the minimal activities it prescribes. A basic management principle concerning motivation and skill development is that those who must implement a program should be involved in developing the relevant policies and practices (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Few districts, however, involve principals, much less teachers, directly in the plan and in program development. In particular, teachers' unions, when they decide to do so, can make important contributions to effective desegregation. An example of such a contribution is the interpersonal relations training program developed by the United Federation of Teachers in Detroit.

Strengthening the Public Information Function

When desegregation occurs, people want to know more about the schools. Too often, the information they seek is not available and rumors and anecdotes, usually negative in character, dominate the information flow. Thus, establishing a professionally staffed public information office should be a high priority for desegregating districts (see pp. 63-65) above, for further comment on this activity).

Strengthen Evaluation Capabilities

Desegregation creates needs for information and new programs require assessment. School systems undergoing desegregation will also experience increased demands for accountability. While some districts resist accountability demands, such resistance feeds suspicions of poor quality and is counterproductive. A capacity for sophisticated evaluation of activities can provide important management information that usually helps in the improvement of programs and the allocation of resources. For example, simplistic reporting of test scores invariably understates the effectiveness of school system efforts to improve educational quality.

While there is no evidence on what the consequences of such a program might be, some members of the study team believe that school districts should be required to provide detailed information about achievement and student attitudes for each major ethnic group in each school, including those omitted from the plan. The purpose of this is threefold: to identify the unsuccessful schools, so that they may receive special help; and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the overall desegregation plan, so as to allay needless fears and concentrate the public's and the school district's attention on the real problems.

This can be done by employing an independent specialist to analyze school-level achievement data for each major ethnic group, and requiring schools to administer questionnaires to students, principals and teachers in each school. (Such questionnaires are commonly used in evaluations of special programs; they are not, however, used routinely by school districts for self-evaluation.)

Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981) argue that the court or civil rights agency can do little directly to improve school quality or ensure building-level compliance with the spirit of a desegregation order. But the court can do a great deal to establish a climate of intelligent discussion about school problems. Parents have very little way to know if their own school is doing an adequate job. Published test scores are little help, since they normally pool minority and majority students who may come from very different neighborhoods and economic backgrounds. Test scores will normally show wide differences between poor and wealthy neighborhoods, and only a trained analyst with access to past as well as present scores can identify schools in neighborhoods whose performance is above or below what can be considered average. Armed with this information, the school system and the public would be able to focus attention on problem schools and use exemplary schools as models.

Structural and Curricular Changes in Desegregated Schools

In the Detroit case, a federal judge ordered the adoption of various educational components as appropriate remedies to past segregation. The U.S. Supreme Court confirmed these aspects of the desegregation plan were justified by the Constitution, saying that "pupil assignment alone does not automatically remedy the impact of previous, unlawful racial isolation" (433 U.S. 282, 287-88). Regardless of the judicial mandate, however, school systems that expect to achieve effective desegregation need to be concerned about how schools respond to the educational and social needs of the students involved.

Because school desegregation is often preceded by years of litigation and controversy about the creation of racially or ethnically mixed schools, it is all too easy to think of desegregation in its narrowest sense and to assume that once racially mixed schools have been set up, the desegregation process is complete. However, it is crucial to recognize that it is precisely at this point in the desegregation process that interracial schooling *begins* for the students and that the nature of students' experiences is crucial to their academic and social development. Thus, this section of the report identifies a number of policies or practices which there is reason to believe will help to create school and classroom environments which will foster academic achievement and more positive relations between majority and minority group members. Effective intergroup relations also discourage voluntary resegregation among students--such as that commonly observed in cafeterias and playgrounds. They also reduce the likelihood that students will be suspended for disciplinary reasons or segregated because they are erroneously assigned to racially identifiable special classes.

Many of these recommendations, such as those about tracking and the utilization of cooperative work groups, deal with the social structure of the school or its classrooms and with instructional methods. Other recommendations focus on building parental and student involvement with the school, with special attention to ensuring the participation of members of all groups. Examples of such recommendations are those relating to extracurricular activities and in-school committees. Still other recommendations are related to discipline policies.

Many of the recommendations in this section are based on the recognition that desegregated schools are often more academically and socially heterogeneous than segregated schools tend to be. This academic heterogeneity makes issues concerning tracking and ability grouping important to effective desegregation. Similarly, it suggests the use of cooperative team learning and other strategies of instruction that have been designed for academically heterogeneous classrooms. The social heterogeneity of desegregated schools, most vividly seen in their racial and ethnic diversity, requires the use of conscious strategies to ensure a reasonable balance of power and recognition among groups to foster interracial interaction, to encourage previously excluded groups to participate in the life of the school no matter which group the school previously served, and to foster equitable treatment for all students while being responsive to the different needs of students from different backgrounds.

One of the things about desegregated schools that many teachers find most discouraging is the apparent absence of close friendships between students of different races and ethnic backgrounds. The experts interviewed in this study tend to agree that such self-segregation, in itself, is not evidence that relations between groups are unfriendly. These experts emphasize that students group together for many reasons, such as neighborhood ties and non-academic interests, and that these are often related to racial or ethnic differences. In short, intimate relationships or first preferences for friends and playmates is a poor indicator of the character of race relations. This natural tendency for intraracial associations means, of course, that the interracial and interethnic interaction that is essential to achieving good race relations is not an automatic outcome of school desegregation and must be promoted through specific programs and activities of the school.

Most of the practices identified here have a much greater chance of success if administrators, teachers, and staffs are knowledgeable and committed. We deal with the issue of professional training in the final section of this report.

Maintaining Smaller Schools

Smaller schools may be more effective in achieving desegregation and fostering integration. All students are likely to participate in some extracurricular activities in smaller schools (500-1,000 students). There is less chance for anonymity and, therefore, less chance for marginal students to drop out because they have no investment in the school. Interaction among students, and between students and adults, is easier in an environment where many of the people know each other. This might make improving race relations easier to accomplish. Moreover, especially minority parents may feel more comfortable in smaller settings.

Whites usually overestimate the proportion of minorities in a given environment and, probably, the more non-whites in that environment (i.e., the larger the school) the more they overestimate. Thus, white flight might be reduced in smaller schools simply because the proportion minority will seem smaller and less threatening than in a larger school.

Small schools may also have disadvantages. Very small schools may be more costly to operate and may make it difficult to offer certain types of programs, especially when they are heterogeneous. For example, bilingual programs could be difficult to implement or maintain. On the other hand, one can imagine a small school organized around bilingual instruction.

Evidence. Barker and Gump (1964) and James Coleman and his colleagues (1966) have studied student participation extensively and conclude participation is higher and students feel that they belong more in smaller schools. The qualitative research and the school district interviews suggest that students are more likely to have interaction with most of their schoolmates in a smaller environment. In addition, a lack of order which parents perennially see as the biggest problem in the public schools (see Plisko & Noell, 1978), is demonstrably easier to achieve in environments which are characterized by interpersonal familiarity (Gottfredson & Daiger, 1979). Ultimately this should reduce white flight and improve instruction. Rossell (1980) found less implementation year white flight in Los Angeles the smaller the minority school.

While the studies do not deal with desegregation per se, Guthrie (1980) has reviewed the research on the relationship between school size and instructional outcomes and concludes, "small schools have the edge."

The study team itself was unanimous in its support of the principle of smaller schools and the view was shared by other national experts we interviewed. However, there was considerable disagreement about what the optimum lower (e.g., 250-500) and upper boundaries on size should be (up to 1400). Clearly, high schools usually need to be larger than elementary schools but even here it depends on the mission of the school.

Illustrative examples. Few desegregating school systems seem to have tried to maintain smaller schools for the educational reasons cited above. On the other hand, many magnet schools have been established and most of these are quite small. Discussions about these schools often stress the sense of community they are able to develop. Metz (1980), for example, describes a magnet school in Milwaukee whose small size has contributed to a sense of shared commitment among parents, teachers and students. The literature on alternative schools provides several examples of well integrated successful small schools (cf. Fantini, 1976).

Maintaining Smaller Classrooms

One belief that almost all teachers and parents share is that small class size makes for better schooling. Since enrollment in most school systems is declining rapidly and many teachers consequently face unemployment, a federal program aimed at retaining teachers in school systems that are desegregating could have positive educational consequences. It might also reduce white and middle class flight.

Evidence. A meta-analysis conducted by Glass and Smith (1978) demonstrates that classrooms with less than 20 students showed increases in achievement with reductions in size. Smaller classes also eliminate one argument used for within-class ability grouping. Teachers frequently argue that they need to break a large class into smaller, more homogeneous groups for instruction. A smaller class makes that less necessary.

There is no evidence that smaller classes would reduce white flight. On theoretical grounds one could reasonably argue that it would be easier to achieve harmonious interracial contact when class size is small.

Reorganizing Large Schools to Create Smaller, More Supportive Learning Environments

If smaller schools are impossible, large secondary schools can create smaller, more effective environments by dividing students into units or houses or clusters within which they establish most relationships.

Evidence. Qualitative evidence suggests that this approach is a particularly good way of reducing anonymity and marginality. It tends to keep misbehaving or low-achieving students involved and supported. It probably reduces minority suspension and dropout rates (Kaeser, 1979b; First & Mizell, 1980; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1976; National School Public Relations Association, 1976). Teachers with fewer different students with whom they regularly interact are less likely to be victimized and the schools in which they teach are less likely to have high rates of student disorder (Gottfredson & Daiger, 1979).

Desegregated Schools Should Have Desegregated Staffs

School systems should provide all desegregated student bodies with desegregated staffs and faculties. A desegregated school with an all-white teaching staff will have more difficulty obtaining good student performance and preparing students for a range of adult roles. Minority students in a school with an all-white teaching staff are more likely to be faced with discriminatory behavior, lower staff expectations for their performance, discrimination in assignment to ability groups and in grades received, and are more likely to be alienated from the school. Moreover, it seems important that minority students have some background role models and that they see minority staff in authority positions. The benefits to national origin minority (NOM) students of same-background teachers would seem to be enhanced when NOM teachers have bilingual and bicultural capabilities.

Evidence. While the available evidence generally supports the ideas above, the research results also make clear that many teachers are as effective or more effective with students of another race than other teachers are with students of their own race. Given this, the available evidence, overall, supports the idea that staffs, especially teaching and administrative staffs, should be desegregated.

Bridge, Judd and Moock (1979) conclude from their review of the very limited research on the subject that minority elementary school students have higher achievement when they have minority teachers, other things being equal. The System Development Corporation (1980) study of ESAA human relations training indicates that minority teachers tended to afford minority students more attention in non-academic situations and to be more equitable in their instructional grouping. Epstein (1980) reported black teachers are less likely than white teachers to place black children in lower tracks. Beady and Hansell (1981) found no differences in the expectations black and white teachers (fifth and sixth grade) held for the performance of black and white students in elementary and secondary schools. Black teachers, however, did have substantially greater expectations for black students' college attendance and completion. Crain and Mahard (1978) show that black students of equal achievement test performance in schools of the same student racial composition will have higher grades if there are more black teachers on the staff, and will be more likely to attend college. They were unable to determine whether this was a result of negative bias on the part of white teaching staffs or positive bias on the part of mixed staffs, but the net effect is that minority students were better off in schools with more minority staff members. Arnez (1978) links disproportionate minority suspensions to a lack of minority teachers and principals.

There is no direct evidence on the impact of a racially mixed faculty on race relations in desegregated schools. Social psychological theory, however, would suggest a positive impact.

Interview data from local respondents and national experts strongly support desegregating faculty and staff. Sixty-five percent of those interviewed on the local level gave a racially balanced staff high priority, and national experts stressed the importance of a racially mixed staff in order to correct the perspectives of students about the relative status of minority and majority group members and to provide role models for minority students. Murphy (1980) reports that educators from several states say that racially mixed faculties are important to effective desegregation.

While minority teachers are often underrepresented in desegregated schools, bilingual education programs often have more than their share of Hispanic teachers, leading to overrepresentation in staff. In Riverside, this situation was criticized by the Office for Civil Rights (Carter, 1979).

Employment of Minority Counselors in Desegregated High Schools

Minority students in desegregated schools tend to benefit from having counselors of the same race or ethnicity as themselves. Such counselors are usually more effective in establishing a rapport with students, are more concerned with minority student well-being, and are likely to be more informed about minority scholarship programs and about admission to traditionally black colleges. A desegregated high school which has, at a minimum, one minority counselor will be more effective in keeping minority students in schools and in making progress at placing minority students in successful college experiences. Counselors in schools where students have limited English speaking ability should speak the language(s) of those students.

Evidence. Braddock and McPartland (1979) have shown that desegregation is self-perpetuating—that minority students in desegregated high schools are more likely to attend desegregated colleges. While this is what we would expect desegregation to do, the results may not always be beneficial for all minority students. (Thomas (1979) has shown that blacks in traditionally black colleges are more likely to obtain degrees than those who attend predominantly white institutions.) It seems likely that some black students in desegregated schools would benefit from knowledge about opportunities in traditionally black institutions. Crain and Mahard (1978) have shown that black students in predominantly white southern high schools which have black counselors are more likely to attend traditionally black colleges, presumably because black counselors are aware of such opportunities. More importantly, they show that students in high schools with black counselors are more likely to obtain scholarship aid in both black and white colleges. Minority counselors are likely to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of minority students and will be of more assistance than white counselors in placing students in traditionally black colleges. If the full benefits of minority counselors are to be secured, these individuals should have training in the nature of the opportunities in predominantly white colleges so that a desegregated college experience is made available to students who can do well in desegregated settings.

Illustrative example. A school board member and desegregation researcher in New Castle County stated that the loss of minority counselors following the implementation of the desegregation plan has contributed directly to the existence of one-race classes at the senior high school level.

Employing an Instructional Resources Coordinator in Each School

An instructional materials coordinator is a certified teacher who has no classroom responsibilities; the coordinator's function is to assist teachers in selecting and obtaining all sorts of teaching materials (books, workbooks, films, computer programs, etc.). The presence of such a staff person could raise achievement of both minority and majority students in desegregated schools. Desegregated classrooms often have very heterogeneous student bodies, and the traditional book-lecture-workbook approach is likely to not be adaptable. Teachers in the classrooms will need to use a wide variety of materials. Unfortunately, teachers do not have the time and knowledge to locate the materials they need, and a school coordinator is needed to do this.

An instructional coordinator can introduce high-technology equipment (TV, computers); plan complex school activities such as major field trips; and serve as a helpful and non-threatening colleague to help staff with specific problems.

Evidence. The Southern Schools report (1973) attempted to measure the impact on achievement of a large number of school resources. The high school resource which was most clearly related to achievement was the presence of a person whose title was "audio-visual coordinator." Less than 10% of southern high schools had such a person, but these schools had markedly higher black and white achievement. In a further analysis, Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981) found that these schools had unusually good race relations, and speculated that this was because students were more involved in school activities which were more varied and interesting, and because teachers, freed from the need to lecture continuously, had more one-to-one relationships with students.

One instructional resource is the computer, used for basic skills drills. The Educational Testing Service (Ragosta, Holland & Jamison, 1980) is observing an experimental use of computers (funded by NIE and managed by the Los Angeles schools). The school system has placed one full-time coordinator in each school, and ETS has concluded that even in a non-experimental situation, a coordinator is necessary.

Illustrative examples. The Jefferson County (Louisville) public schools have staffed their new middle schools with full-time instructional materials coordinators. This person serves not only to provide materials, but as a peer with whom teachers can talk with about problems. A related idea was also used in this district: an ESAA-funded Materials Workshop for teachers from a number of schools met once a month for a year. This was judged to be the most successful of all their ESAA projects. Not only did the group serve as a source of materials, but it also provided social support for teachers, many of whom were in buildings with weak administrators. Marshall (1975) describes his duties in this role at the Martin Luther King school in Boston. The Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools' (Kaeser, 1979a) publication Orderly Schools That Serve All Children describes the work of coordinators in several exemplary schools.

College Preparatory Programs in All Secondary Schools

Although magnet schools may reduce the perceived costs of desegregation, particularly to the middle class, they also may stigmatize the non-magnet schools in a desegregated school district. College preparatory courses offered in all secondary schools (except specialized schools) offer diversity to all students, prevent stigmatizing, and may help keep middle and upper middle class students in the public school system.

College preparatory courses in all schools will prevent class and racial resegregation within the public school system by keeping some middle class whites and minorities in the non-magnet schools (or withdraw them altogether) if the non-magnet school their child was assigned to had no college preparatory courses.

Evidence. The qualitative research supports the proposition that this will reduce white flight, but there is no quantitative evidence on the matter. There is indirect evidence that such programs have particular relevance to Asian Americans. Reanalyses of the Coleman data (Mayeske & Beaton, 1975; Boardman, Lloyd & Wood, 1978) have confirmed the importance of college preparatory programs to the aspirations as well as achievement of Asian Americans. Several experts interviewed emphasized the importance of this strategy.

Desegregated Schools Should Utilize Multiethnic Curricula

During the past fifteen years a considerable amount of effort has been expended on developing various curricular materials which reflect the diversity of the American population. This effort reflects a widespread consensus that such curricula have a positive effect on interracial and interethnic understanding. Two trends in such developments have been most notable. First, textbooks have been revised. Second, many schools have developed minority-oriented courses. These two trends are similar in that they both seek to provide students with more information about minority groups than do more traditional curricula. They are different, though, in that one incorporates materials of special relevance to minority groups within the regular curriculum, whereas the other tends to isolate it in special units or courses.

A great many school systems now say they use some type of multiethnic curricula. It is assumed that doing so will enhance ethnic pride and reduce negative ethnic stereotypes. Furthermore, the presence of such curricula, ideally, enhance the extent to which students receive an education which accurately reflects the contributions of various groups to American society. Ethnic studies courses are said by their advocates to serve some of the same purposes as multiethnic curricula. However, some authors argue against the use of minority studies programs in secondary schools on the grounds that they often do more damage by resegregating students than the good they accomplish. Other experts point out that ethnic studies courses should not be seen as a substitute for a multiethnic curriculum but rather an integral component of a comprehensive multiethnic curriculum which builds understanding of other cultures and knowledge about and pride in one's own. Multiethnic curricula can also be tied to the development of English-language skills by bilingual learners.

How can a good multiethnic curriculum be distinguished from an unsatisfactory one? It is not uncommon for publishers to tout as "multiethnic texts" books which are basically very similar to traditional texts but which have a few blacks or Hispanics pictured in them. Furthermore, the mere utilization of multiethnic texts hardly constitutes a multiethnic curriculum. As many authors have pointed out, a thorough-going multiethnic curriculum would be reflected in many other aspects of the school as well, including its wall displays, its library, and its assembly programs. The effectiveness of multiethnic curricula that address the needs of NOM students will be enhanced if a critical mass of such students is present in particular schools.

Evidence. Almost all experts and a good many qualitative articles and books stress the importance of multiethnic curricula to effective desegregation. There are several studies which suggest a weak but positive relationship between the use of multiethnic curricula and/or minority oriented courses and positive student race relations (Forehand & Ragosta, 1976; Genova & Walberg, 1980; Litcher & Johnson, 1969; System Development Corporation, 1980). A few studies show no effect, but there do not appear to be any studies which show a negative relationship. Even if multiethnic curricula have no consistently strong impact on race relations, they have the obvious advantage of tending to present a balanced and hence potentially more accurate picture of American society. Other research (Slavin & Madden, 1979) shows, however, that a multiethnic curriculum is less effective than interracial interaction in achieving better race relations. It seems likely that interracial interaction and multiethnic curricula reinforce each other and have an additive effect.

Illustrative examples. The Montgomery County School system is in the midst of developing a program whereby its own teachers will develop multicultural units for use in the system's schools. A carefully selected group of teachers will be paid during one summer to develop these materials which will then be introduced to other teachers during inservice training.

The necessity of examining closely material which purports to be multicultural is made clear by one study (Blom, White & Zimet, 1967) which found that a reader designed as part of an "urban multiethnic" series a) had more of its stories set in suburban than urban settings, b) had a higher proportion of "failure" themes than comparable "traditional" readers, c) devoted the stories about blacks exclusively to those about black families living in stable white neighborhoods, and d) restricted blacks in its stories to "family" roles rather than having them appear in both family and work settings.

In Minneapolis, the curriculum has been changed to reflect the background, heritage, and history of all minorities so that all students would understand contributions to America made by minorities. A board member interviewed for this study stated that not only did minority students learn about themselves but also, minority students learned that many of their beliefs about minorities were wrong.

Banks (1979) provides some useful checklists which schools can employ in order to assess the extent to which they do provide a complete multiethnic curriculum.

Desegregated Schools Should Maximize Parental Involvement in the Education of Their Children

There is strong consensus that involving parents in the school is an important strategy for success in desegregation. At both the elementary and the secondary level, the use of parent aides, either paid or volunteer, can be important. This is especially true if the aides are parents of the bused-in group, since this increases the school's channels of communication with the sending school community. At the elementary school level, parental involvement strategies are often intended to improve achievement by helping parents supervise homework and tutor students, both in the school and for their own children at home.

Many desegregating school systems lack the staff and materials to provide the enriched multiethnic curricular and extracurricular experiences that a school needs to offer in order to promote various desegregation goals. Utilizing parents, especially minority parents, as resource persons and as role models can be an effective means of overcoming such deficits. Such programs, however, tend to fade away over time and teachers and principals must know how to use parents in significant ways, if parents are to stay interested.

Evidence. No empirical study has examined the impact of parents working in educational roles in desegregated schools. The qualitative literature does offer support for this strategy. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1976) and the Murphy (1980) reports both support this as a meaningful and effective strategy for reducing within-school racial isolation. Murphy found particularly strong support for using Hispanic parents, for example, as school resource persons to enhance multiethnic curricular content and orientation.

While there is little systematic evidence from desegregation studies relating to parental involvement, other research attests to the usefulness of this strategy. Shipman and her colleagues (1976), for example, found that mothers who said they felt welcomed and supported by their childrens' school, participated more in their child's education. Armor and his colleagues (1976, p. vi) found for black students (but not Hispanic students) that "the more vigorous were the schools' efforts to involve parents and community in school decision making, the better did [the sixth graders studied] fare in reading achievement." Coulson (1976) found achievement to be related to parents being more in the classroom. Wellisch and colleagues (1976) found that parent aides were more effective than paid "outsiders."

Illustrative examples. Charlotte, N.C. used parents as volunteers in tutorial programs. The superintendent there reports that 10,000 parents have served as volunteers in various activities.

A good inventory of ways to involve parents in schools is Working with Your Schools published by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' State Advisory Committees in Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and New Mexico.

Desegregating Schools Should Develop a Comprehensive Student Human Relations Program

Each school should develop a two-part human relations policy for its students: 1) curricular aspects of human relations inside the classroom, and 2) special programs for the entire school.

The classroom aspects of the policy would include multiethnic textbooks, role-playing projects and discussions of race relations as they occur in the classroom, the school, the community and American society generally. The most important classroom aspect of the policy would be to assign students to interracial teams to work together on class projects or otherwise create opportunities for black, NOM, and white students to interact. Obviously, these curricular changes should be thought out in advance and will not be as effective if introduced after the conflict has arisen. The programs that are most effective are those that are integral to the day-to-day learning experiences and social interactions students have. In other words, the more integrated with other activities and the less obvious they are, the more integration they are likely to achieve among students. One reason for this appears to be that teachers and administrators, while they may think good human relations is a desirable objective, often do not place this goal above other, more traditional, goals of schools--such as teaching reading, language arts, or history.

The special programs aspects of the human relations policy would include activities such as multi-racial school-wide student committees, special movies, assembly speakers, and school-wide recognition of the birthdays of minority political leaders and other important events in American race relations. One idea the panel found attractive is to teach students about the desegregation controversy in their own community, especially the reasons why the judge or the school board required desegregation. That is, what are the facts and issues in the local case.

These special programs should not be regarded as substitutes for the curricular aspects of the school human relations policy. Furthermore, the specifics of the individual special programs may not be as important as the fact that their presence symbolizes to students that administrators, teachers, and staff have a high regard for positive human relations. The more teachers and principals talk about the importance of good human relations and behave accordingly, the more impact specific programs are likely to have. It is very important that human relations programs begin at kindergarten (or before where appropriate) because attitudes toward other races and cultures may be significantly shaped by the time students are 10-12 years old. Human relations programs should seek to foster understanding and interaction among different minorities, as well as between whites and racial and ethnic minorities.

Evidence. Experts on school desegregation are in considerable agreement on the importance of human relations programs, although they differ on how much change they feel can be achieved through them. Most agree that interracial and interethnic contact is essential to making substantial gains. Textbooks are no substitute for more experiential learning. All experts agree that human relations programs should begin at the earliest grade as does the available research on the formation of race-related attitudes (Katz, 1976).

Slavin and Madden (1979) found that assigning pupils to interracial teams in the classroom was the most effective of the eight practices they studied for improving race relations among students. This practice was strongly correlated with positive racial attitudes and behavior for both whites and minorities. McConahay (1981) reviewed the experimental studies of interracial cooperative teams and found that across a variety of settings and a number of techniques for setting up the teams, the practice produced more positive attitudes and behavior and improved academic achievement in some instances. (For further discussion of cooperative team learning, see the strategy which follows.)

The effects of special programs or curricular materials on race relations were not as strong as those for interracial teams, but Slavin and Madden (1979) report some association with positive attitudes among whites. Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981) found that schools purchasing human relations materials had better race relations and the SDC Human Relations Study (1980) found that special programs directed toward students produced improved attitudes and behavior and improved self-concept among minority students. This study, the most extensive to date focused on human relations, also found that human relations programs were most effective when they were: (a) coordinated with the regular instructional program, (b) increased intergroup contact, and (c) supported by school and district officials.

Illustrative examples. Experts agree that the best types of human relations programs are those that are so well integrated with the curriculum, instructional practices, and extracurricular activities that it is not possible to identify them as being distinct programs. An example of an instructional strategy that subtlely involves human relations objectives is the various types of cooperative learning. However, more visible and limited programs can also have positive effects. Gwaltney describes student human relations programs that are conducted by a school district located in a large eastern industrial and commercial center where minorities comprise 53% of the student population (Carney, 1979b). Student communication workshops have been organized involving between 20 and 25 students per workshop, some parents, and one or two teachers, and are held during the school day at various locations including some outside the schools. Students participate in human relations exercises that are designed to increase trust and reduce threat among themselves and particularly among students of different racial and economic backgrounds. Teachers who attend are encouraged to continue the workshop exercises in the classroom. The court ordered the districts to implement a program in Cleveland in which students explore the history of segregation and the desegregation suit in that city. But, no evidence on that program's effectiveness is yet available.

In Shaker Heights, Ohio, the school system instituted a number of human relations activities for elementary school students. These activities included development of a resource room to which white and minority students may go for recreation after lessons are completed. The room is designed to encourage interracial interaction during play. Another activity is a hands-on program sponsored by a local museum. Students of different races are encouraged to interact in a learning environment outside the classroom.

Minneapolis secondary school students participate in the formulation of human relations guidelines and are involved in planning and conducting school-wide lectures and seminars of human relations topics. Over the school year, a variety of ethnic observance days are set aside and schools participate in programs designed to foster understanding of a number of ethnic cultures, not merely black and Hispanic. The Green Circle program has been implemented with apparent success in many school systems, including Nashville and New Castle County.

Provide Opportunities for Cooperative Learning, Including the Use of Student Teams, in Desegregated Schools

One set of techniques widely used to improve student relations, to improve the academic achievement of low-achieving children and minimize the problems of teaching academically heterogeneous classrooms is "cooperative learning." These techniques usually involve the creation of teams of students. Each team of roughly four to six students represents the full range of ethnic groups, ability, and gender in the classroom. Academic work is structured so that the children on each team are dependent on each other but also so that disparity in achievement levels does not automatically lead to disparity in contributions to goal attainment. So, for example, one team learning technique (Jigsaw) is structured so that each child is given information which all group members need to complete their work. Another team learning technique (STAD) gives rewards for *improvement* in academic performance, so that students with weak academic backgrounds have the potential to contribute as much to the success of the team as do the best students.

The work of Elizabeth Cohen and others (1980) on the Multi-Ability Classroom has shown promising results in fostering equal participation and influence in cooperative learning groups. The multiple ability approach is designed to counter the effects of status generalization in academically heterogeneous and racially integrated classrooms. Rosenholtz (1977), for example, found that children seen as high in reading ability and high in status in group reading tasks also have high status in groups with tasks that do not require reading.

There are many varieties of cooperative learning. For example, national origin minority children might serve as tutors in foreign language courses.

There is a considerable body of evidence which suggests that various types of cooperative learning techniques, a) lead to higher than usual academic achievement gains for low-achieving students who are involved, and b) almost always improve relations between majority and minority group children.

One of the advantages of these cooperative learning techniques is that they are relatively easy to implement. They can be used by a single teacher without requiring the cooperation of other teachers and administrators. Also, they can be used for only a portion of the school day or for only a short period of time over the semester. Finally, they do not require a major investment in learning new techniques or in setting up administrative procedures. Books and manuals which explain implementation procedures are available as are some curriculum materials already organized for use by student teams. Some consideration has been given to extending the team learning approach to encompass an entire school, with classrooms competing as units to achieve academically, improve attendance or discipline, etc. To our knowlege this has not yet been done. However, the idea seems promising.

There is also some reason to believe that less structured forms of academic cooperation are helpful in improving race relations. However, considerable care needs to be taken in designing such cooperative experiences so that they do not put low-achieving children at a disadvantage. Teachers who understand the basic theory of cooperative team learning are more likely to be effective in adapting particular programs to their classroom situation.

Evidence. The research evidence showing positive effects of various structured cooperative learning team strategies is strong, although the impact of some of these techniques such as Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) and Student Teams-Achievement Division (STAD) have been more frequently studied than that of others. For recent reviews of research of cooperative learning techniques see Slavin (1980) and Sharan (1980). Some of the studies of cooperative academic teams have been conducted in classrooms with Hispanic children as well as Anglos and blacks. The conclusions drawn from this work are generally similar to those found in the more numerous studies of biracial classrooms. Perhaps because the evidence on this issue is so strong, the national experts interviewed as part of this project chose cooperative learning with great frequency as a specific means for minimizing discriminatory resegregation within schools.

The evidence relating to the impact of encouraging academic cooperation between majority and minority students without employing specific well-tested team techniques like those described above is less clear. Yet, it is strongly suggestive of a positive impact. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1976) found support for this strategy as a means of reducing resegregation. Two recent large correlational studies also suggest a positive effect of academic cooperation on race relations. Slavin and

Madden (1979) found that assigning black and white students to work together on academic tasks was quite consistently related to positive outcomes on six different indications of students' interracial attitudes and behavior. Similar findings about positive benefits of team-organized schools is reported by Damico, Green and Bell-Nathaniel (1981). In addition, recent studies have suggested that cooperative intergroup contact in the classroom may improve at least some children's self-concept (System Development Corporation, 1980) and attitudes toward school, especially for blacks (Damico, Green & Bell-Nathaniel, 1981).

Several studies provide evidence that the multiple ability intervention helps to equalize status and participation in small mixed-ability groups of both single-race and multiracial composition (Stulac, 1975; Cohen, 1979; Rosenholtz, 1980). In addition, low-achieving minority students have been found to exhibit more active learning behavior in classrooms (Cohen, 1980; Ahmadjian-Baer, 1981). There is no evidence on the relationship of the behavioral changes to achievement outcomes in the multi-ability environment.

Although these studies suggest the positive impact of a variety of classroom procedures which encourage cooperative intergroup contact, there is research which suggests that several factors may influence just how effective such contact is in improving race relations. Specifically, some studies by Blanchard and his colleagues (1975) show that the positive impact of cooperation is greatest when the group succeeds. Also, other research suggests that whites are more attracted to blacks who perform competently in a group situation. These lines of research, combined with research by Cohen and her associates, indicate that careful attention should be paid to structuring cooperative learning so that situations are not created in which the participation and status of different groups are very unequal.

Illustrative Examples. The techniques for cooperative learning that are most widely discussed are:

> Teams-Games-Tournament. Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) is built around two major components: 4-5 member student teams, and instructional tournaments. The teams are the cooperative element of TGT. Students are assigned to teams according to a procedure that maximizes heterogeneity of ability levels, sex, and race. The primary function of the team is to prepare its members to do well in the tournament. Following an initial class presentation by the teachers, the teams are given worksheets covering academic material similar to that to be included in the tournament. Teammates study together and quiz each other to be sure that all team members are prepared.
>
> After the team practice session, team members must demonstrate their learning in the tournament, which is usually held once a week. For the tournament, students are assigned to three person "tournament tables." The assignment is done so that competition at each table will be fair--the highest three students in past performances are assigned to Table 1, the next three to Table 2, and so on. At the tables, the students compete on simple academic games covering content that has been presented in class by the teacher and on the worksheets. Students at the tournament tables are competing as representatives of their teams, and the score each student earns at his or her tournament table is added into an overall team score. Because students are assigned to ability-homogeneous tournament tables, each student has an equal chance of contributing a maximum score to his or her team, as the first place scorer at every table brings the same number of points to his or her team. Following the tournament, the teacher prepares a newsletter which recognizes successful teams and first place scorers. While team assignments always remain the same, tournament table assignments are changed for every tournament according to a system that maintains equality of past performance at each table. For a complete description of Teams-Games-Tournament, see Slavin (1978).
>
> Student Teams-Achievement Divisions. Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD) uses the same 4-5 member heterogeneous teams used in TGT, but replaces the games and tournaments with simple, 15-minute quizzes, which students take after studying in their teams. The quiz scores are translated into team scores using a system called "achievement divisions." The quiz scores of the highest six students in past performance are compared, and the top scorer in this group (the achievement division) earns eight points for his or her team, the second scorer earns six points, etc. Then the quiz scores of the next highest six students in

past performance are compared, and so on. In this way, student scores are compared only with those of an ability-homogeneous reference group instead of the entire class. A "bumping" procedure changes division assignments from week to week to maintain equality. Students know only their own division assignments; they do not interact in any way with the other members of their division. The achievement division feature maintains the equality of opportunity for contributions to the team score as in TGT. A complete description of STAD appears in Slavin (1978).

Jigsaw. In Jigsaw, students are assigned to small heterogeneous teams, as in TGT and STAD. Academic material is broken into as many sections as there are team members. For example, a biography might be broken into "early years," "schooling," "first accomplishments," etc. The students study their sections with members of other teams who have the same sections. Then they return to their teams and teach their sections to the other team members. Finally, all team members are quizzed on the entire unit. The quiz scores contribute to individual grades, not to a team score as in TGT and STAD. In this sense, the Jigsaw technique may be seen as high in task interdependence but low in reward interdependence, as individual performances do not contribute directly to a group goal. In the Jigsaw technique, individual performances contribute to others' individual goals only; since the group is not rewarded as a group, there is no formal group goal. However, because the positive behavior of each team member (learning the sections) helps the other group members to be rewarded (because they need each others' information), the essential dynamics of the cooperative reward structure are present.

Slavin (1978) constructed a modification of Jigsaw called Jigsaw II. In Jigsaw II, students all read the same material but focus on separate topics. The students from different teams who have the same topics meet to discuss their topics, and then return to teach them to their teammates. The team members then take a quiz, and the quiz scores are used to form team scores as in STAD. Thus, Jigsaw II involves less task interdependence and more reward interdependence than Jigsaw.

Small-Group Teaching. Small-Group Teaching is a general organizational plan for the classroom rather than a specific technique. It places considerable emphasis on group decision-making, including assignment of group members of tasks, and on individual contributions that make up a group product rather than a less well-defined group task. Cooperative rewards are not well-specified; students are simply asked to cooperate to achieve group goals (Slavin, 1980).

Multiple-Ability Classroom. Mixed-ability groups are assigned cooperative learning tasks which require a number of abilities and do not exclusively rely on reading, writing, and computation skills. In addition, students are prepared for the task by

> discussing the range of abilities it requires and are instructed that while no group member will possess all of the necessary skills, every member will be able to contribute at least one. The multiple ability assignments may be preceded by Expectation Training in which low-status students are prepared for special tasks which they then teach to other students (Cohen, 1980).

These various cooperative learning techniques are in place in hundreds of school systems throughout the county. The STAD procedure has been endorsed by the U.S. Department of Education as an "idea that works." Detailed information about this program, and help in adopting it, is available from the National Diffusion Network, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20203.

Peer Tutoring Can be a Strategy for Dealing with Achievement Diversity

The most common peer tutoring model is cross-age tutoring, in which older children teach younger children, both usually low-achieving students. Peer tutoring can be used, however, within age groups and for students of all levels of ability. The rationale is that the tutee will benefit from the additional individual help, and the tutor will also learn more through teaching and preparation for teaching. An additional rationale is that cross-age interracial tutoring can be used in integrated heterogeneous (e.g., multi-age, non-graded) classrooms, not only to accommodate diverse achievement levels but also to foster improved race relations (Gartner, Kohler & Riessman, 1971).

Evidence. Considerable evidence exists of cognitive and affective gains for older, low-achieving tutors. Evidence of comparable effects for tutees is more equivocal. Some studies show positive academic and attitudinal changes for both tutor and tutee, while others have found that the benfits for the former do not also accrue in same measure to the latter (Devin-Sheehan, Feldman & Allen, 1976).

While positive results have been found for both black and white same-race pairs, very few studies have examined mixed-race pairs. One that did so found that cross-race tutoring produced greater interracial interaction and acceptance for both tutor and tutee, although there were no significant gains in achievement (Devin-Sheehan, et al., 1976).

Eliminate the Grouping of Students in Separate Classes by Ability in Elementary School

Students are separated by ability level for some or all of their instruction in most American schools. In elementary schools, one practice is to assign students to classrooms at a particular grade level based upon ability. Ability is usually measured by standardized tests, grades, and teacher reports. This practice should be eliminated in schools that seek to desegregate effectively. Another form of "academic segregation" is the division of children within a class into recognizable ability groups. The practice can, if the groups are more or less permanent and are continued across subjects, be as dysfunctional as ability grouping by classroom. Indeed they may be more damaging because they reinforce stereotypes and student self-devaluation. However, grouping for instruction in particular subjects for portions of the school day should not necessarily be eliminated.

Evidence. The evidence is clear that these assignment practices tend to segregate students by race (Findley & Bryan, 1971; Mills & Bryan, 1976). The reason is that ability measures, such as standardized tests, sort students by socioeconomic status and race. Teacher reports and grades are also biased by assumptions related to race and socioeconomic status. The evidence is also clear that this assignment pattern does not improve achievement for low ability or high ability groups (Findley &

Bryan, 1971; Epstein, 1980; and others). This generalization seems to apply even to very low achieving students, assuming that students experience good teaching. One major study, for example, found that in three out of four schools studied, students in need of compensatory education who were "mainstreamed," did better than those in special classes and in the fourth there was no difference between the groups (National Institute of Education, 1978). Further, the achievement and self-esteem of low-ability students generally seem to be harmed by grouping. Race relations cannot be improved when students are separated in segregated classrooms or groups for instruction. The evidence is also clear that teachers prefer classes with a limited range of ability if they are assigned to groups of students with high or average ability but not if they are assigned to classes with low ability (Findley & Bryan, 1971). It is the popularity of ability grouping with teachers that has guaranteed its continuation and not its obvious instructional value. Despite Gabe Kaplan's flair with the sweathogs in Welcome Back Kotter, there is little evidence that teachers with the greatest experience and teaching ability are assigned to low-ability classes.

Empirical research reported by Epstein (1980) shows that eliminating tracking in the elementary schools will have little effect on achievement scores but that flexible grouping (allowing for status change) and other organizational structures (active-learning and equal status programs) have positive effects on black students' achievement.

Examine Carefully Any Within-Classroom Ability Groups That Do Not Change

More than three-fourths of elementary school teachers group children for reading and mathematics. Often children grouped on the basis of one skill (usually reading), are kept in these groups for other subjects and classroom activities and this may be quite inappropriate. Schools should examine such grouping practices carefully to determine whether they are flexible. Is it possible for children to move up? Do they, in fact, improve and move up to higher ability-level groups?

Evidence. Within-class grouping for reading and math based upon standardized measures of ability or based upon experiences a child first brings to kindergarten or first grade usually segregates students by race within groups in the classroom. Within-class grouping by ability for reading and math is not clearly superior to other methods of organizing a classroom, though this depends on the extent of heterogeneity. Epstein (1980) found that black students did better in less resegregative programs; they benefitted from participation in equal status learning programs and from flexible grouping.

Teachers prefer ability grouping because it limits the range of student experience and knowledge (which they call ability) with which they must contend at any one time. The need to continually re-examine the rigidity of grouping procedures is underscored by the finding that teachers who express low support for integration are more likely to use homogeneous grouping strategies than those who support it (Epstein, 1980; Gerard & Miller, 1975). The evidence on impact of within-class grouping on race relations is inconclusive. Schofield (1981) suggests that this is due to the variety of ways in which in-class groups may be used. In general, however, race relations are improved by interracial contact and seldom improve in the absence of such contact (McConahay, 1981).

The dangers of such within-class grouping are that decisions made about a child's ability are made very early in the school career (grades K or 1) and are simply honored by each succeeding teacher providing little chance for change. If those decisions are unexamined by teachers, principals, parents or children, they become self-fulfilling prophecies. This possibility is strengthened by the observation that students who have been classified as less able may receive less instructional time, attention and material than more able students (Rist, 1970; Oakes, 1980; Green & Griffore, 1978).

Eliminate Rigid and Inflexible Tracking and Grouping in Secondary Schools

Two types of grouping occur at the high school level. One is a form of ability grouping, sometimes called leveling, in which courses such as English and mathematics have different levels of difficulty. The other arrangement, usually called tracking, refers to a differentiated curriculum. There are usually three tracks: college preparatory, vocational, and general. Leveling should be limited, flexible, and determined for each subject separately. Students and parents should be allowed to choose the level of work for the student after recommendations from school personnel. Tracking should be flexible, with students allowed to choose from both college preparatory and vocational courses. Students should not have to declare for the college preparatory or vocational track so that they have separate criteria to meet for graduation depending upon track membership, and that might exclude them from post-high school options.

Evidence. The evidence is clear that leveling and tracking tend to segregate by race with black, Hispanic and foreign-born students overrepresented in lower levels and in vocational and general tracks (Harnischfeger & Wiley, 1980). Larkins and Oldham (1976) indicate that leveling and tracking not only resegregate students while they are in their leveled or tracked classes, but that they affect students' schedules for all other classes. This leads to resegregation in classes not consciously tracked. Local interviews confirm the existence of this problem. The experts interviewed suggested that schools eliminate grouping by ability and allow students to choose freely among vocational or college preparatory courses without having to declare themselves in a particular track. Grouping, although not necessary to good instruction, is, however, extremely popular. Its abolition may be impossible to achieve in the near term.

The empirical evidence of the impact of tracking and leveling on race relations is quite mixed, but generally it suggests that the impact is negative. Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981) find that ability grouping in newly desegregated southern junior and senior high schools (meaning sorting English and other basic classes by ability while leaving electives, gym, and other courses heterogeneously grouped) tends to have harmful effects on achievement but beneficial effects on race relations, and that ability grouping in elementary school has harmful effects on both.

The evidence on the impact of grouping or leveling on achievement at the secondary level is the same as that at the elementary level—negative impact on low-ability groups (which have high concentrations of minority children in desegregated districts) and no consistently positive impact on high ability groups (Froman, 1981). The results of studies are extremely mixed and seem much more likely to be related to teacher behavior, student-teacher interaction and the structure of the instructional process within groups rather than the grouping itself. There is a limit to the diversity that classroom teachers can handle. Without expertise in classroom management and knowledge of instructional strategies most appropriate for heterogeneous classes, extreme student diversity will defeat most teachers and the learning needs of students will not be met (Evertson, Sanford & Emmer, 1981). A recent analysis of leveling by Oakes (1980) indicates less time is spent on instruction in low levels and teachers have lower expectations for homework. "Teacher clarity" and "teacher enthusiasm" were found in greater proportions in high-level rather than low-level classes. Although it is widely believed that leveling and tracking keep middle class whites in desegregated schools, there is no evidence to support this contention. In fact, almost all school systems use the practice, including those with high levels of white flight.

National experts were nearly unanimous in rejecting ability grouping or urging extremely restricted use of ability grouping at all levels of instruction. Similarly, the consensus literature generally attributes detrimental effects to ability grouping and tracking.

School Officials, Staff and Teachers Receive Training in and Develop Explicit Policies and Procedures for Identifying and Placing Students in Special Curriculum in Non-Discriminatory Ways

This strategy calls for school officials, staff and teachers to be trained in assessment procedures that will reduce the disproportionate assignment of minority students to special curriculum (EMR for example) and further, that school systems develop explicit policies governing such placements. For example, students with limited English proficiency should not be tested in English. Moreover, schools should seek linguistically and culturally relevant information and advice in order to reach informed decisions regarding special education placement of national origin minority students.

Evidence. Systematic research on the effects of alternative assessment procedures on the classification of minority students is virtually nonexistent. An application of Mercer's technique (1973) did produce a reduction in the identification of Hispanic children in California as retarded. The use of learning potential assessment has led Budoff (1972) to conclude that a large number of IQ-defined retardates do have learning ability and are not mentally retarded but educationally retarded. Hargrove and his colleagues (1981) found that schools in which the referral process was more consultative referred fewer students for testing, but there was no systematic effect on race of referrals. Studies of the implementation of P.L. 94-142 (Stearns, Green & David, 1980) and similar state legislation (Weatherly, 1979) indicate that the interdisciplinary procedures dictated by the law are widely used, but the relationship of these practices to placement decisions is not known. There is evidence, however, of strong bureaucratic constraints on the deliberations of interdisciplinary teams; they frequently reach professional consensus before parents are involved and consider only a narrow range of service options (Weatherly, 1979).

There is clear evidence that testing of bilingual children in their primary language has a positive effect on their performance. When the plaintiffs in the Diana case (Diana v. State Board of Education, 1970)—nine children classified as EMR—were retested in Spanish, only two of them scored below the IQ cutoff for EMR, and the lowest score was only 3 points below the cutoff.

Mackler (1974) calls for an assessment team approach (inter-disciplinary model) to prevent the segregation of minority students. Both local and national experts emphasized the importance of this strategy. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1976) report is also a source of support for this strategy.

Illustrative examples. A variety of alternative assessment procedures have been developed that are intended to reduce reliance on standardized intelligence tests. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) Criterion-referenced assessment describes a child's test performance in terms of level of mastery of specific skills, rather than in comparison with a normative distribution. It is a method of test interpretation rather than a type of test; no normative or peer-referenced implications are drawn. Examples of criterion-referenced assessment include "mastery testing" (Mayo, 1979) and "domain-referenced testing" (Nitko & Hsu, 1974).

2) Learning potential assessment uses a test-teach-retest paradigm in order to assess the child's actual learning ability and strategy. The Learning Potential Assessment Device (Feuerstein, 1979, p. 17) is accompanied by Instrumental Enrichment, educational techniques designed to "enhance development in the very area of cognitive deficiency that have been identified by the LPAD" (Haywood, 1977, p. 17).

3) Interdisciplinary assessment combines the perspectives of a variety of professionals who have worked with the child, including the child's classroom teacher. Under P.L. 94-142, the parents are also included, as well as the child when appropriate. The rationale is that multiple sources of information about the child's behavior in a variety of settings will reduce reliance on test scores in making placement decisions and thereby reduce minority disproportion (Mackler, 1974).

4) The consultation model prescribed by Johnson (1976) is not a method of psychologial assessment but rather a process by which the necessity of testing is determined. The school psychologist consults with the referring teacher and other school personnel to devise ways of working with the child in the regular classroom, and continues with testing only if these strategies are not effective. The rationale is that in many cases a teacher's referral may be a request for help and should not automatically be interpreted as a step toward special education placement.

5) The System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (SOMPA) integrates several approaches to non-discriminatory assessment in an attempt to control for different sources of bias. The SOMPA, developed by Mercer and Lewis (1978), adopts pluralistic norms for standardization, includes an ecological assessment of adaptive behavior, and uses the interdisciplinary process with emphasis on parent involvement. Although its psychometric basis remains controversial, the SOMPA represents the best organized model of non-discriminatory assessment available at this time (Cook, 1979).

Comments. P.L. 94-142 (federal legislation) demands that "testing and evaluation materials and procedures used for the purposes of evaluation and placement of handicapped children must be selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory" (112a. 530-b). U.S. District Court Judge Peckham (San Francisco, 1972) ruled in Larry P. v. Riles that "Individual intelligence tests could not be used in the decision making process to place black children in EMR classes."

Establish Clear and Consistent Expectations for Student Behavior in Each School

During the initial year of desegregation, some students are in new buildings with different expectations for behavior. When expectations are ambiguous and when they are applied inconsistently, students are confused and sometimes angered. The increase in minority suspensions following desegregation may occur in part because minority students are more often moved into previously white schools than white students are moved into previously all minority schools. Minority students are thus required to adapt or to assimilate into a different set of rules or a different culture.

Special attention to cooperative, open development of a set of behavior expectations at each school building during the initial period of desegregation may reduce disproportionate minority suspensions. This does not mean that writing a new code of conduct in which the rules are uniform in all schools is sufficient. The key point here is that minority and majority parents, and students together with teachers under the leadership of the principal, must come to some common agreement about the way everyone is expected to behave in the school. That agreement about expectations must be communicated to everyone in the school, including teachers. If the approach taken is one of understanding differences in acceptable behavior rather than one of total assimilation of minority children into the majority expectations, then minority suspensions are likely to be reduced.

Evidence. The qualitative literature supports this as an important way of reducing misbehavior for all students during desegregation. National experts support this position and emphasize early notification of parents when infractions occur. Gottfredson and Daiger's (1979) analysis of data from 600 schools provide strong support for this approach. Specifically, this study finds that order will increase if schools:

1. Develop schools of smaller size, where teachers have extensive responsibility for and contact with a limited number of students in several aspects of their education, and where steps are taken to ensure adequate resources for instruction.
2. Administer schools in ways that are clear, explicit and firm.
3. Promote cooperation between teachers and administrators especially with respect to school policies and sanctions for disruptive behavior.
4. Develop school rules that are fair, clear, and well publicized and apply the rules in ways that are firm, consistent, persistent and even-handed.

Research by Emmer, Everston and Anderson (1979) emphasizes the importance of establishing and enforcing classroom and school norms early in the school year.

Analyze Carefully the Reasons for Disproportionate Minority Suspensions

Students are suspended from school for a wide variety of reasons. Minority students are almost always suspended in disproportionate numbers in relation to their percentage in the school or district. Minority suspensions frequently increase immediately after implementation of a desegregation order particularly in previously all white schools. This suggests that their use may be an attempt to limit the impact of desegregation and resegregation.

While some infractions are objectively measured, such as truancy, possession of drugs or weapons and the like, many, such as disrespectful behavior, insubordination and dress violations require personal judgments by school officials. Most of the questions raised about unfair disciplinary actions are raised with respect to sanctions for these ill-defined offenses.

Schools should keep records on suspension including the reason for the suspension, the teacher or staff person involved, and the race and sex of the student involved. This allows the school principal, parents and others to analyze the reasons for suspension by race and sex, and to determine if particular teachers or staff people have problems needing attention. Until the leadership in a school understands the causes of disproportionate minority suspension in that school at that time, solutions are impossible.

Not very many districts and schools conduct such analysis on their own without outside pressure. It is viewed as threatening, but it is essential to understanding disproportionate minority suspension and identifying solutions for the problem.

Evidence. The reported associations of lack of support for desegregation with perceptions of increased discipline problems (Peretti, 1976) and reports by school officials we interviewed that communication problems contribute to increased discipline problems, underscore the importance of monitoring subsequent to desegregation. In some cases, where detailed records have been kept, minority students have been found to be suspended more often for "subjective" offenses and for less serious offenses than their majority peers (Foster, 1977; Study Group on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, 1978). Columbus, Ohio, at the order of the court, has undertaken careful analysis of suspension and other data. The Columbus plan has been operating for two years. Second year data show slightly more suspensions, but the racial disproportion has been reduced from year one. Cleveland analyzed suspensions by reason and race (Kaeser, 1979a), but did not use the data in rewriting their code.

Limit the Number of Offenses for Which Suspension and Expulsion Can Be Used

Suspensions are used extensively in American schools, generally for behavior that is not considered dangerous to persons or property. As many as half of all suspensions are for violations of attendance policy. The widely varying suspension rates among schools, sometimes schools with similar student bodies in the same city, suggest considerable discretion exercised in the choice of this technique for dealing with student infractions.

Student advocates such as the Childrens' Defense Fund (CDF), the South Eastern Public Education Project (SEPEP), and professional associations such as the National Education Association (NEA), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), all agree that the overall numbers of suspensions ought to be reduced. All of these organizations have recommendations for the proper way to do this.

One easy place to begin is to prune suspendable offenses from a district's discipline code. Most districts have a laundry list of 15-25 offenses. Eliminating suspension for truancy, tardiness and other absence-related offenses is a first step. A second category of offenses for which suspension should be limited are vague ones such as "failure to comply with authority." Spell it out or throw it out.

Illustrative examples. Sample codes are available from the following organizations:

Children's Defense Fund
New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools 1520
517 The Arcade
Cleveland, OH 44114

Harvard Center for Law
and Education
6 Appian Way, 3rd Floor
Cambridge, MA 02138

National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N..
Washington, D.C. 20036

South Eastern Public
Education Project
1338 Main Street
Columbia, SC 29201

National Association of Secondary
School Principals
1904 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

American Association of School Administrators
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, VA 22209

Create Alternative In-School Programs in Lieu of Suspensions

When suspensions are disproportionately minority, they have the effect of resegregating students outside of schools and where minority students make up a relatively small proportion of a school, suspensions may also resegregate schools. If in-school suspension removes substantial numbers of minority students from regular classes to in-school discipline programs, these alternatives may themselves contribute to resegregation. Regardless of its effect on resegregation, however, suspensions are to be avoided whenever possible. The absence of alternatives to suspension may make teachers and administrators reluctant to suspend disruptive students.

Both disruption and disproportionate suspensions defeat the purposes of desegregation and result in a loss of public and parent support for the school system.

Effective in-school programs in lieu of suspensions in desegregated schools have five important characteristics:

a. They identify the individual problem that led to the misbehavior;
b. They provide assistance, support, encouragement or active intervention for solving the problem (this includes help for teachers and students--sometimes teachers have problems dealing with particular kinds of student behavior);
c. They actively work at helping the student keep up with academic work or help him or her to catch up if they are behind;
d. They reduce dramatically or eliminate totally the number of out-of-school suspensions; and
e. They do not resegregate students within the school.

There are several types of alternative programs. Not all of them always meet the five characteristics of an effective program, but they can if implemented properly. They are called student referral centers, time-out rooms, in-school suspensions (ISS), pupil problem teams, counseling and guidance programs, Saturday and evening schools, and other names. Just establishing one of these programs will not guarantee a reduction in disproportionate minority suspensions since the causes of the disproportion in the particular school must be understood and addressed by one or more of these programs.

Evidence. Use of alternatives to suspensions is a growing phenomenon but evaluation data tend not to be very complete or to address fully the impact on resegregation of students. Many programs point to reduced use of out-of-school suspension as a result of implementing an alternative (National Institute of Education, 1979, pp. 80, 100; Bader, 1978). There is also evidence of low recidivism in some programs; NIE (1979) describes a counseling program in which fewer than 12% of participants have been subsequently suspended, and an ISS center in which 93% had neither been suspended nor returned to ISS (pp. 98, 100). Even without a reduction in racial disparity, a reduction in numbers of students suspended should reduce resegregation.

Indications of reduced minority disproportion in suspension rates are few, even though this issue has been a major factor in recognition of "the suspension problem" that led to the establishment of many alternative programs (Garibaldi, 1979). The Dallas schools report a black suspension rate of close to 40%, the proportion of black enrollment, after the institution of ISS programs under a court order (Cotton, 1978). In Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, four out of five middle schools in which an "intervention room" was established reduced their minority suspensions by 28% while in the unserved schools, minority suspensions increased by 29% (National Institute of Education, 1979, p. 84). The PASS (Positive Alternatives to Suspensions) program in Pinellas County, Florida reduced suspensions or held them constant while an increase was observed in control group schools; after the program was introduced in all Pinellas County high schools, the number of suspensions was cut by more than half.

ISS program administrators and observers continue to express concern about the degree of racial isolation and disproportion in the alternative programs themselves. Arnez (1978, pp. 33-34) cites the Louisville system as an example in which referrals to a separate school program were overwhelmingly black while those to an in-school program were mostly white. Arnove and Strout (1980) observed similar situations in other large cities. Participants in the NIE conference observed that ISS centers could become just as disproportionately minority in composition as were out-of-school suspensions. These programs can become identified as "minority programs," especially when they involve a voluntary transfer to an alternative school (Williams, in NIE, p. 18).

Illustrative examples. The Positive Alternatives to Suspension (PASS) program in Pinellas County, Florida, is widely publicized. It includes regular classroom instruction in human relations, basic encounter groups for students and staff, parent training, and school and home "survival courses" for students with behavior problems (Bailey, 1978). Other effective programs are described in Creative Discipline, a periodical published by SEPEP, and by First and Mizell (1980). (See also Foster's Hillsborough County Study, 1977; NIE In-school Alternatives to suspension report, April 1979; Kaeser, 1979b)

Desegregated Secondary Schools Should Ensure Desegregated Student Governments

It is important that the formal leaders of the school be representative of the racial and ethnic groups of the school. Student government can play an important role in establishing a favorable racial climate in the school. However, in newly desegregated schools, elections may become racial referenda with bloc voting that prevents members of the school's smaller racial or ethnic group from obtaining seats in the government. The principal should act in this situation to make it clear to the student body that a one-race student government is unacceptable.

Principals have used a variety of techniques to ensure that student government is desegregated. Some have replaced the conventional student council with a multiethnic student committee with a fixed number of seats for each group. Others have required elections to be among slates of candidates, each slate representative of the school's racial mix. Some principals have simply announced that they will not approve any elections which do not result in a multiethnic group of officers. Any of these techniques could work. (We do not recommend proportional representation systems of voting, which encourage minority voting for one's own group and generally result in confusion.)

Election of multiracial student governments is a necessary first step, but by itself it is not a panacea. In particular, the election of a minority class president in a majority-white school is not evidence that any of the school's racial problems are solved.

Evidence. The studies by Crain, Mahard, and Narot (1981) and by Forehand and Ragosta (1976) present evidence that integration of the student elite is a valuable desegregation technique. Case studies reported in Rist (1979) support this idea.

Illustrative example. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, administrators established a 6-3 representation of white and black students for student government councils. The school board rejected the administration's plan but the students themselves subsequently adopted the same plan. Student race relations in that system have been widely reported as exemplary.

Desegregated Secondary Schools Should Have a Student Human Relations Committee

Many southern communities created biracial citizen committees to deal with local racial issues. While they were advisory bodies with no formal power, they nevertheless often were able to intervene in racial issues and resolve them before they reached flash point temperature.

Many high schools in the South have done the same thing with a student committee, called a bi/multi-racial committee or a human relations committee. These groups receive information and complaints from other students, and transmit to the administration information about problems and recommendations for their solution. They also organize human relations activities, organize special projects, and provide rumor control. In many cases, they are given credit for preventing a racial confrontation; and when a crisis does occur, there are a ready-made source of trained student leadership to help mediate it.

Bi-racial committees, multi-racial committees in school systems with significant numbers of NOM students, and human relations committees are sometimes elected, sometimes appointed by the student government, and sometimes appointed by the principal. In some cases the officers elected and the other committee members are volunteers.

Evidence. Forehand and Ragosta (1976) conclude that student human relations committees contribute to the effectiveness of desegregated high schools. Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981) present evidence in support of this proposition.

Desegregated Schools Should Maximize Opportunities for Student Participation in Integrated Extracurricular Activities

It is well known that good race relations can best be brought about by personal contact between white and minority students in an atmosphere of cooperation toward a common goal. This means that for a desegregated junior high school and secondary school, the extracurricular activities program may be a central mechanism for creating true integration. Not only will a strong extracurricular activities program strengthen school race relations, but the improved student morale could spill over into improvements in achievement as well.

Schools must do two things: they must offer enough different kinds of extracurricular activities to involve virtually every student, and they must work to ensure that all these activities are integrated. To do this, schools must assign staff time to extracurricular activities and must plan their program carefully to minimize organizations which will appeal to only one group, or organizations which elect their own membership on diffuse grounds (such as overall "popularity") which will often be racially biased. The principal must monitor the extracurricular program carefully. In a desegregated school, there must be adequate transportation to allow students to remain after school. This may be expensive, but the potential benefits seem substantial. Alternately, some schools have scheduled a time period during the school day for extracurricular activities. Since few teachers have special training in the management of extracurricular programs, inservice training is important.

The capacity for some types of extracurricular activities needs to be established by the school system early. For example, schools without string programs in early grades are not likely to have desegregated orchestras.

Extracurricular programs that most need strengthening are:

1. Female athletics programs. There is reason to believe that minority girls have a particularly difficult time being integrated within desegregated schools.
2. Programs for junior high school students
3. Intramural athletics in larger schools
4. Interest-clubs: (electronics, automotive, foreign language, clothing, computers, bowling)
5. Service organizations (volunteer groups for in-school or out-of-school programs). These must be controlled to prevent them from becoming "prestige" clubs.

6. Human relations groups.

These can be made more effective if a socially and ethnically representative group of the school's participants are involved in planning, developing and supporting extracurricular activities. Doing so may reduce the occurrence of one-race activities.

A strong extracurricular activities program will also work to build community support for desegregated schools. It involves the parents in the school through assistance in activities and attending games and concerts, it is a good source of media attention, and it provides opportunities for students to make contact with adults (through, for example, raising money). However, extracurricular activities often become resegregated unless efforts are made to prevent this from happening.

Evidence. There is also some empirical evidence that minorities are underrepresented in extracurricular activities. Theory and research suggest that participation in extracurricular activities, especially in those activities requiring cooperation (such as athletic teams or music groups), can have a strong positive impact on intergroup relations. The theoretical work is derived from researchers such as Allport (1954) and Sherif (1958) who argue that cooperation can lead to improved intergroup relations. The empirical work is exemplified by Slavin and Madden's (1979) study showing that participation in interracial athletic teams is associated with positive intergroup relations. Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981) show a number of positive benefits associated with high levels of extracurricular participation, and find that achievement is higher in schools with strong programs.

Two sources in the qualitative literature support this strategy (Southern Regional Council, 1973, 1979), as a way to foster more effective desegregation. The consensus literature is nearly unanimous in its support for this strategy (Smith, Downs & Lachman, 1979; Forehand & Ragosta, 1976; Murphy, 1980). The experts we interviewed provide considerable support for this strategy but do not link it directly or solely to the reduction of resegregation.

On the issue of how to develop extracurricular programs, 86% of our interviewees report some form of post-implementation community involvement ranging from in-school committees to district-wide committees. Forty-three percent reported these committee efforts were effective in producing student acceptance of desegregation from which we may infer that resegregation was reduced.

Illustrative examples. Shaker Heights, Ohio will not fund or otherwise support extracurricular activities that are not racially integrated. Some schools have converted the homeroom period into a social group activity. One school grouped entering ninth graders together with a teacher into a homeroom period and left the group and teacher together for the four years of high school. Each homeroom was ethnically balanced and conducted various social activities over the four years. There was considerable resistance to this program from some teachers who felt unskilled in groupwork.

Some school systems have emphasized the importance of extracurricular activities by taking them as an indication of the success of their overall efforts. For example, in Stockton, student participation is used as a measure of evaluation of integrative results of desegregation (Carter, 1979).

Establishing Multiethnic In-School Parent and Teacher Committees to Provide Counseling and to Handle Grievances of Parents, Teachers and Students

Following school desegregation, some school systems have instituted in-school committees that provide advice and guidance to parents, teachers and students and serve as mediators to resolve grievances. These contribute to effective desegregation if the parents are committed to desegregation, know what to do to make it effective, and if the committees remain multiethnic. Such groups can reduce resegregation by providing an interpretation of experiences and behaviors encountered by parents, teachers and students in order to prevent responses that result in student withdrawals from classes or activities, by choice or decree. The success of such committees is heavily dependent on the support they receive from school administrators in the form of commitment and responsiveness.

Evidence. No empirical research explicitly examines this strategy. Qualitative discussions of this strategy are alluded to by authors calling for greater parent (especially minority parent) involvement in the schools. The reasoning is that such involvement increases community and parent ownership and concern for the school which may no longer be a "neighborhood school" and that parents provide examples for their children.

Local interviews and interviews with national experts reinforced the need for these grievance committees: several local experts specifically noted the positive consequences of community involvement in grievance-dispute settlement at the school level.

While the strategy has met with some success, it must be pointed out that obtaining and sustaining the participation of low-income and minority parents is often difficult since often they must travel greater distances and usually will have employment obligations that make participation difficult. Unless special arrangements are made to overcome such obstacles, in-school parent committees can, and often do, become all-white over time.

Almost all of the local respondents indicated that the success of in-school parent committees depended upon school principals encouraging and supporting the active involvement of parents. Local experts agreed that such committees should be advisory as did the national experts.

Illustrative examples. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1976) reports that this strategy was helpful in reducing resegregation by calming parental fears and by helping to clarify teacher and student relations. Specifically mentioned were Denver's P.L.U.S. (People Let's Unite for Schools) effort and the C.E.C.s (Community Education Councils).

Where these in-school committees have remained multiethnic in structure and have treated substantive issues, parents are reported to have gained a "sense of ownership" for their schools as reported in Evanston, Illinois; Wilmington, Delaware; and Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina.

In Charlotte, beginning with and following implementation, the superintendent, other city and school officials and parents manned an information control center that was instrumental in receiving and treating parental and student concerns. This effort continued to operate for two years at night.

Strategies for Inservice Training

School desegregation presents most educators with new experiences which challenge their professional capabilities and their personal values and dispositions. Almost all desegregation plans or programs provide for some type of inservice training. In addition, most experts agree that inservice training is necessary to prepare educators for changes in schools that result from desegregation.

Genova and Walberg (1980) assert, for example, that teachers typically require inservice training to effectively implement specific activities of desegregation plans. Felkner, Goering and Linden (1971) argue that balanced, well-structured training programs provide teachers with knowledge, insights, and skills to cope with change. Such programs are thought to combat rigidity in teachers' attitudes and instructional practices by providing ways for teachers to develop flexibility in dealing with new instructional demands and challenges in interpersonal relations. W. H. Banks, Jr. (1977) claims that many of the problems experienced during the desegregation of the Jefferson County, Kentucky schools might have been avoided if teachers and administrators had received more extensive and better planned inservice training to deal with both anticipated and unanticipated change. J. A. Banks (1976) stresses the need for inservice training to prepare educators to work successfully in ethnically pluralistic situations.

Despite such agreement and exhortation, educators frequently express skepticism about the usefulness of inservice training for desegregation. Indeed, such doubt regarding the effectiveness of widespread and often uncritically planned and implemented inservice programs may be well founded. While most desegregation experts place emphasis on the importance of inservice programs, remarkably little literature exists that makes a convincing case for the effectiveness of particular training strategies. The greatest portion of the literature on desegregationspecific training is qualitative and descriptive. Empirical studies are in short supply.

The usefulness of inservice training in any school setting depends on at least four factors: 1) the manner in which training is conducted, 2) the content of training, 3) what groups participate in the training programs, and 4) who conducts such training. The purpose of this section is to review what the available evidence suggests about effective strategies for inservice education in desegregated schools with respect to each of these four factors.

The evidence on desegregation-specific training is problematical for a number of reasons. No consensus exists on what criteria constitute effective or successful inservice training activities. Some studies determine program effectiveness in terms of changes in participants' attitudes and behavior; others emphasize effectiveness in terms of changes in student attitudes, behavior, or achievement. Most research on training for desegregation stresses effects on the attitudes and behavior of teachers, usually measured in terms of perceptions of the trainees, their supervisors, or other observers rather than in terms of more systematic and objective modes of assessment. For example, Carney's (1979b, 1979c, 1979d) studies, which are among the best in this field, evaluate training programs in 16 school districts throughout the nation in terms of observed changes in teacher and administrator behavior, subjective determinations of program effectiveness based on perceptions of participants, or in some instances, speculation about the relationship between inservice training and student outcomes. In addition, little research examines the impact of inservice training with respect to actual classroom or administrative practice over an extended period of time. This problem is particularly important; because little longitudinal evidence exists, our knowledge of whether the effects of training carry over to classroom practice is seriously curtailed.

There is some limited evidence that assesses the effects of desegregation-specific programs in terms of perceived relationships between training and increases in levels of student achievement and student-teacher interaction or decreases in levels of student-teacher or student-student conflict. A reasonable argument can be made that if inservice training for desegregation influences changes in participants' attitudes, behavior, and instructional skills, those developments will result in changes in school environments that serve to improve student attitudes, behavior, and achievement. However, taken together, studies of inservice programs for desegregation present insufficient evidence to support propositions of direct or indirect causality between desegregationspecific training and student outcomes.

This discussion relies heavily on two recent studies of inservice training in desegregated schools by King, Carney and Stasz (1980) and Carney (1979b, 1979c, 1979d). Other evidence is drawn upon where applicable. For instance, evidence presented by Bailey (1978), Beckum and Dasho (1980, 1981a, 1981b), Williams (1980), the Institute for Teacher Leadership (1979), and the System Development Corporation (1980) supports one or more of the propositions about inservice training for desegregation outlined below. Also, this assessment utilizes evidence from interviews of local and national experts. In general, however, data on the effectiveness of inservice training for desegregation are fragmentary, and, although some consensus emerges regarding overall approaches to effective training, discussions and evaluation of specific desegregation-related strategies are varied and not documented in many cases. (See Carney, 1979a, as an example of a synthesis of the varied literature on desegregation-specific training.)

In the research, as in practice, distinction is often made between desegregation-specific inservice training and general inservice training. In many respects, these two types of training are very similar. The problems teachers and administrators confront in desegregated settings are usually variations of the problems and opportunities educators face prior to desegregation. At the bottom line, the goals of desegregation-specific and general inservice training are the same—enhancing student achievement, improving interpersonal relations among students and educators, developing classroom management and discipline techniques, and stimulating curricular innovation.

If problems in desegregated settings are variations of problems encountered by educators in non-desegregated contexts, we may gain useful information about the effectiveness of different approaches to desegregation-specific training from research on general training programs. We might hypothesize, for example, that if certain approaches to interpersonal relations training in non-desegregated settings are found to improve student-teacher interactions, similar approaches might be effective in desegregated settings if they are adjusted for differences in educational context. On this basis, evidence from studies that examine the impact of inservice training in general is discussed when appropriate. Many of these studies shed light on relationships between training and both teacher and student outcomes that are alluded to, but not demonstrated, by most of the studies on desegregation-specific training.

The strategies discussed below focus on the relationship of inservice training to improving teacher and administrator attitudes and behavior in desegregated settings and how this relationship influences student outcomes. Where data from studies of general inservice training programs are noted, it is done so with great caution because of hypothetical generalizability. Research on general inservice training is fraught with similar problems of validity as research on desegregation-specific programs. (See Hyman, 1979, for a discussion of problems inherent in assessing research on general inservice training.) We present them to illustrate more general relationships between training and educator and student outcomes than are revealed in studies of training for desegregation. This section does not give much attention to the content of the curricula or the nature of the instructional techniques inservice training aims to provide to educators. Descriptions of those strategies are found, at least in outline form, in the sections of this volume that deal with strategies to improve student achievement, promote better human relations among students, avoid resegregation within schools, and so forth. This section is concerned primarily with strategies that promote useful and effective inservice training.

The first strategies discussed in this section outline general approaches to inservice training for desegregation that appear to be most effective. The remaining strategies deal with various types of desegregation-specific training and with the need for training that includes administrators.

Conducting Inservice Training for Desegregation

The design of an inservice training program involves two types of decisions: What topics or content should be addressed? How should training be conducted? Most discussions focus on the first of these questions. However, unless inservice training is developed in ways that promote learning and behavioral change, efforts spent designing the content of programs have little consequence. Observers generally agree that the strategies used in inservice training lack the sophistication of instructional strategies that educators themselves employ to facilitate learning in the classroom.

There are few studies that empirically examine the impact or effectiveness of particular types of inservice training on teacher and administrator attitudes and behavior or how inservice training affects student achievement and race relations. Despite the lack of comprehensive data, some agreement exists that certain general strategies of inservice education will be effective in enhancing the knowledge and capabilities of educators with respect to instructional techniques, curricula, interpersonal relations, and discipline. Each should be considered in planning and implementing inservice training programs for teachers, administrators, and other target groups.

1. Faculty members, administrators, and non-professional staff should understand the desegregation order, the desegregation plan, and the implications of the plan's implementation to the district, individual schools, and inservice participants.

2. Topics of inservice training programs should be germane to individual participants, their needs and day-to-day problems. Program development should be predicated on a needs assessment conducted by school staff.

3. Programs that aim for long-range changes need follow-up components which focus on individual problems of participants applying training in the classroom. Classroom implementation of training should be monitored and follow-up sessions should be planned to assist participants.

4. The specific content of inservice training should be oriented toward school-level and not district-wide concerns. Small group formats are better than larger multi-school formats because they allow for identification of and concentration on problems of individual participants in single school settings.

5. Training should be practical with "hands-on" experience and product-oriented outcomes for immediate application. There is consensus that abstract, theoretically oriented training programs offer little immediate assistance to teachers and administrators and, as a result, participants tend to view such programs as providing slight, if any, benefit.

6. Participants should be included in the planning and design of inservice training programs.

7. If trainers are brought in from outside the school system, they need knowledge of district and single school matters. Teachers and principals often respond better to peers from their own and other schools than they do to professional consultants.

8. Whenever possible, faculty and staff of host schools should be involved in the conduct of inservice training.

9. All members of groups targeted for training should participate. Ideally, training should be perceived by educators as important enough to warrant full participation. Realistically, incentives should be provided for total participation in inservice training. Financial rewards, course

credit, or certificate-renewal credit might be offered. If strategies for voluntary participation fail, training should be mandatory.

10. Inservice training should be incorporated as a component of total school or district functions. Desegregation-related training should be tied to central concerns of educators such an enhancing achievement and classroom management.

11. Training programs should be continuous. Simply providing workshops before schools open or infrequent training sessions is not likely to have much effect.

12. Little attempt should be made to directly change attitudes of participants. Preaching is ineffective and often dysfunctional to program goals.

13. Program goals should be well established and communicated to participants before training begins.

14. Programs on different topics should be coordinated and linkages between training areas should be established to provide continuity.

15. Teachers and administrators should participate in programs together since they can reinforce each other to implement what is learned through training programs. Furthermore, teachers and administrators need to develop school-level norms that foster more effective desegregation-related practices.

No one type of inservice training format "works" across all school settings. Inservice training planners should be wary of adopting a program model without modification simply because that model has been thought effective in another school or district. Effective types of inservice training programs appear tailored to specific settings and address themselves to particular problems of those settings. Generally, however, effectiveness of inservice training may be predicated on participation in programs, not merely attendance at them. While no particular format can or should be recommended, it is important to note that the evidence suggests that training incorporating dialogue, in the form of discussion between participants and trainers and among participants themselves, is more effective than training through lectures or other means that preclude active participant involvement.

Evidence. Analyses by King et al. (1980) and case studies edited by Carney (1979b, 1979c, 1979d) of inservice training programs in desegregated school districts support the general strategies outlined above. In a survey of 16 desegregated school districts, King concludes that the most effective training programs are those based on a formal needs assessment, and furthermore, those which are well planned and evaluated. King defines a "formal" assessment method as one that is routinized, clearly understood by trainers and administrators, and can be described by most district staff members. Most of the training programs examined in this study did not include assessment, planning, or evaluation components.

Evidence from the Carney case studies suggests that each of the above strategies relates to effective inservice training in general. No one case study discovered all of the strategies; some indicate that one or more of the strategies are associated with effective inservice training and others indicate that the absence of one or more of the strategies contributes to the ineffectiveness of training. No quantitative data are presented in these studies. Conclusions are based on observations made by investigators and on faculty and administrator responses concerning perceived effectiveness of training.

Williams (1980) argues from the findings of surveys and interviews of school personnel, parents, and students in six southern states that no one strategy or set of strategies is adequate to facilitate successful inservice training strategies. Training should not be fragmented in content or short-term in duration. In addition, he asserts that training should involve all targeted personnel and foster colleagiality. Beckum and Dasho (1981a) stress that provision of concrete behavioral strategies is essential if inservice training is to have any long-term impact. In addition, they argue from evidence presented in their case study that all training programs should be predicated on needs assessements of school personnel and conducted on a school-wide basis.

Howey (1978) reports that teachers surveyed in a four-state study perceived job-related training more effective if conducted by colleagues rather than by university professors or other outside consultants. Teachers believed they were more sensitive to individual and school-related problems and concerns than were outside trainers. In addition, surveyed teachers preferred small group formats that allow discussion and problem-sharing to large lecture programs or courses held outside their schools.

National and local experts interviewed believe that teacher training should be on-going, inservice and preferably school-based, reflecting the needs of each school. One psychologist argues that training should entail "hands-on experiences" rather than sensitivity training or programs based on abstract or theoretical presentations. Another national expert, a sociologist who has conducted research and training, urges that inservice programs be mandatory for both teachers and administrators. This expert does not believe, however, that particular types of training or particular training topics should be mandatory for all desegregated or desegregating school systems.

Illustrative examples. Davila identifies factors attributed to effective inservice training in a northeastern "commuter town" district that enrolls about 6,300 students (Carney, 1979b). Forty-five percent of this student population is minority. Administrators and teachers in general viewed inservice training emphasizing instructional strategies and human relations as very effective in improving staff attitudes and instructional competencies. Current training programs shifted emphasis from district-wide concerns to issues and needs of individual schools. Although training was mandatory for both teachers and administrators, participants were able to choose among topics designed to address individual concerns. These topics ranged from techniques to increase student motivation and achievement to increasing teacher self-awareness and empathy. Both desegregation-related and non-desegregation-related themes were incorporated in the overall training program organized by the district. There were, as a result, no perceived differences between desegregationrelated staff development programs and others offered. Teachers attributed the effectiveness of the training to its small group format that incorporated a "hands-on" approach to solving real problems they have in the classroom. They also thought that their active involvement in the total inservice training process (planning and implementation of the programs) increased the effects and benefits of the training to those who participated.

Gwaltney reports that a school district located in a large eastern industrial and commercial center attributed the effectiveness of its inservice training programs to similar factors (Carney, 1979b). In this larger district, where blacks constitute 48% of the enrollment, training concerned with instructional strategies and human relations was perceived effective by teachers and administrators because programs emphasized identification and discussion of individual teacher's needs. The format of the district's inservice activities was individual instruction rather than large group sessions. Classroom demonstrations were incorporated in the total training procedure that included workshops and discussion sessions. Trainers worked with participants in their classrooms, observing, conducting evaluations, and participating in actual instruction. Follow-up sessions were provided until teachers thought they had shown improvement in training areas. Teachers were given "hands-on" experience in practical skills that could be applied directly in classroom settings.

Types of Inservice Training

Types of inservice training for desegregation generally fall into four categories: 1) instructional methods, 2) curricula, 3) self-awareness, empathy, and interpersonal relations, and 4) discipline and classroom management techniques. In some instances, training involves topics about parent involvement in school affairs and developing human relations programs for students. Each of the four general categories of program content is addressed below with discussion of training to involve parents in school activities. Programs to train educators to plan and conduct human relations programs for students are excluded in this study for two reasons. First, almost all research on this topic relates directly to studies of inservice programs on curricula and interpersonal relations. Second, human relations programs can include almost any topic and improving relations among students is closely associated with instructional strategies used, curricula taught, and the ways teachers and administrators deal with students. Because efforts to improve human relations among students embody aspects of other inservice training discussed in this study, it would be redundant to single out this concern as a unique subject of training.

Although each of the topics of inservice training for desegregation is examined separately, their contents are not mutually exclusive. All, in fact, are related. Evidence from the research strongly suggests that schools develop training programs that deal with each of the topics examined here and that these topics be correlated with each other. One topic may be emphasized more than another, as established by individual school's needs assessments, but no one content area should be stressed at the exclusion of the rest. Such an approach is dysfunctional to overall program goals. For example, training teachers and administrators to administer discipline and classroom management techniques alone may prove counter-productive without programs in self-awareness of attitudes and behavior, empathy, and interpersonal relations.

In addition, topics of inservice training for desegregation relate to topics addressed in general inservice training for improving academic achievement and interpersonal relations among students, teachers, and administrators. The components of desegregation-related training are also similar to those of bilingual training programs. Common emphases include training areas such as assessment of learning needs and styles of students in heterogeneous classrooms and cultural awareness. In much the same way that processes of inservice training for desegregation are similar to general inservice training, program topics addressed in desegregation- related training correspond to those that should be presented in training related to other areas of the educational enterprise.

Inservice Training Related to Instructional Methods

This type of inservice training addresses instructional methods that may be used to improve student, particularly minority, achievement in classrooms that have become more heterogeneous as a result of the desegregation process. Such classroom heterogeneity may be reflected in student academic ability and achievement as well as in student academic preparation. Inservice training related to instructional strategies is often incorporated in programs on basic skills (reading and mathematics) and multiethnic curricula. This section deals with inservice training as it relates to instructional techniques; in the following section, inservice training as it relates to course content is discussed.

Often, teachers in desegregated schools are confronted with instructional situations in which techniques that are successful with homogeneous student groups no longer apply, or at least, are more difficult to implement. Inservice training that centers on specific instructional strategies to assist teachers in heterogeneous classrooms can provide practical options to outmoded instructional techniques and opportunities for resolution of problems that result from the implementation of new strategies. Examples of instructional techniques that are useful in heterogeneous classrooms include cooperative learning, small group or individual instruction, and team teaching. (For description and discussion of these and other types of instructional techniques, reference should be made to the section on cooperative learning in this volume, pp. 101-108.)

Classroom instruction does not take place in a vacuum. Adoption and application of new instructional techniques must be considered after assessment of the contexts in which new strategies are to be employed. Braun (1977) argues, for example, that failure to successfully develop and implement new instructional strategies may be due to a lack of perception and understanding of new ethnic and cultural contexts in desegregated schools. This argument suggests that inservice training in instructional strategies should be combined with programs designed to assist teachers and administrators understand the nature and characteristics of their changed student bodies.

While successful implementation of new instructional strategies may be dependent on an understanding of the ethnic and cultural contexts in which these strategies are to be applied, it appears that mere understanding of ethnic and cultural contexts is ineffectual in improving student achievement without provision of training in specific instructional strategies. Beckum and Dasho (1980) argue that inservice programs which seek to promote an understanding of cultural and ethnic differences are not enough to adequately prepare staff members to teach diverse student groups. According to this study, training must also provide concrete instructional strategies that address different academic needs of students in desegregated settings.

Another argument may be made that training in instructional strategies alone may have less impact than if this type of training is combined with training in new approaches to curricular content. Evidence exists which suggests that training in methods relates to improving teachers' attitudes toward students and teaching as well as to increasing student achievement. Yet other evidence indicates that improvements in these teacher-related and student-related outcomes may be enhanced if training in instructional methodologies is couched in training on new approaches to curricular content. This relationship is examined further in the discussion below on inservice training related to curricula.

Evidence. King et al. (1980) conclude that inservice training for teachers related to instructional strategies is effective in improving teacher competency and teachers' approaches to diverse student enrollments. Teachers and administrators surveyed in the study indicate that this type of training is important and most desire expansion of programs related to instructional technique.

While these studies find no data to indicate that inservice training in this area leads to improvement in student achievement, it seems reasonable to assume that improved teacher competency in instructional techniques leads to improvements in student achievement. It may also be that improved teaching techniques improve classroom management which may be related to positive changes in student discipline, student relations, and academic achievement.

The Institute for Teacher Leadership (1979) stresses that in order for teachers to meet the changing academic needs of students in a desegregated setting, they should undergo training in instructional techniques that match the different learning styles of minority and white students. The Carney (1979b, 1979c, 1979d) case studies also emphasize the need for and general effectiveness of inservice training in instructional techniques.

Several studies that examine the impact of inservice programs in non-desegregation-related settings suggest that training in specific instructional techniques does lead to improved student attitudes about learning and increased student achievement. Whitmore, Melching and Frederickson (1972) found evidence that student reading and math achievement in grades 2-7 improved significantly after their teachers had undergone inservice training in the areas of development and use of instructional objectives, implementation of concepts of learning modules and mastery tests, and employment of contingency classroom management techniques. Moore and Schaut (1976) conclude that training teachers to use instructional strategies to reduce student inattention increases student attention levels. This study suggests that such inservice training positively relates to improving student achievement inasmuch as increased student attention facilitates learning. In another study, Kruse (1976) found that students of teachers that participated in training oriented toward child-centered instructional strategies showed an average one year gain in reading skills across pre-test and post-test measures.

In a 1976 study, Fitzmaurice found that inservice training in diagnostic-prescriptive approaches to instruction not only produced higher levels of student spelling and reading achievement but improved teachers' attitudes toward students. This study suggests that a relationship existe between instructional strategies and teachers' attitudes in improving student achievement. It further suggests that teachers' attitudes may partially be determined by ability to employ successful instructional strategies. In other words, an implication of the Fitzmaurice study is that teachers' attitudes toward students may be improved by training that provides instructional methods that may be used in situations where other strategies have proved ineffective.

A survey of elementary teachers in Urbana, Illinois presents evidence that supports this hypothesized relationship between instructional proficiency and the attitudes of teachers toward their students. Marcum (1968) found that although teachers in this district generally favored desegregation, a substantial proportion expressed reluctance to work with minority students. The reported data suggest that this unwillingness was due not to racial prejudice but to teachers' beliefs that they were not qualified to teach minority students. Marcum's research implies that if teachers are provided training in instructional strategies for desegregation, feelings of inadequacy may be prevented and teachers may adopt more positive attitudes toward minority students.

In a more recent study, Chow, Rice and Whitmore (1976) argue that inservice training in tutoring skills for mainstreamed settings resulted in significant gains in teachers' attitudes toward academically disadvantaged students. Gains in student math achievement were attributed not only to the application of new instructional methods but to improvements in the attitudes of teachers. Teachers who did not receive training in these techniques showed no significant gain on the measures of attitude and their students exhibited no improvement in achievement.

Illustrative examples. King and Graubard identify in a case study outcomes of inservice training in instructional strategies through a teacher learning center (Carney, 1979b). The school district that implemented this program is located in a small, largely middle class eastern community with a student enrollment that is 62% white, 27% black, and 11% Hispanic. Staff development at three of the elementary schools and the district's middle school is coordinated through a teacher learning center directed by an outside consultant. The center offers structured inservice activities that focus on teaching educators about styles of learning and on enhancing their effectiveness in the classroom. Training includes discussion and demonstration teaching by trainers in the teachers' classrooms. Neither trainers not participants view the program as primarily related to desegregation, but they all believe the success of desegregation would be enhanced if teachers continue to learn to recognize and respond to a more varied range of learning styles.

Hunter found evidence of effective training in instructional strategies in a school district located in a western urban area of approximately 75,000 residents (Carney, 1979d). The student population of the district is 13,750, 50.5% of which is minority. Inservice training programs sponsored by a state-funded professional development center focus on skills training in five areas: using behavioral objectives, diagnosis and prescriptive instruction, lesson analysis, and application of learning theory through instructional techniques. The program is structured around five cycles. Each successive cycle is based on completion of the former. The cycles begin by emphasizing basic knowledge, understanding and application of effective instructional skills. The cycles conclude with on-site assistance to participants in the implementation of techniques. As the program becomes institutionalized, original participants become trainers inasmuch as they are utilized in the on-site assistance component. Most teachers indicate that the inservice program has been very helpful in making them feel more competent about supervising instructional processes. Most respondents also believe that improving teaching methods leads to improved student academic achievement, although test scores in this district have not shown an upward trend.

Inservice Training Related to Curricula

School desegregation often results in increased demands for educational quality. These demands translate into re-examination and alteration of existing curricula, development of multiethnic, multicultural and human relations curricula, and, perhaps, development of alternative "magnet" programs to meet the educational interests and needs of more diverse student bodies. A greater capability for teaching from a multicultural perspective is often required of all teachers regardless of what courses or grades they teach. As a result, teachers frequently express a need for inservice training that helps them make curricular transitions and provides them with instructional strategies that may be used to teach new curricula.

Often, inservice training in curricula goes hand-in-hand with training in instructional strategies. Programs that stress new content areas should be accompanied by training in implementation to facilitate application in the classroom. In other words, training related to new instructional techniques may be necessary to ensure that the new curricula are implemented successfully.

It would not be feasible to outline the content of the various types of new curricula that schools might adopt to facilitate desegregation. There is a large literature on basic skills instruction and bilingual education that is beyond the scope of this discussion. Some of the basic elements of multicultural, multiethnic and human relations programs have been identified, however, in earlier sections. Whatever new types of curricula schools choose to adopt, training should be extended to all staff members that are responsible for implementing these programs of study.

Of particular importance is that teachers and administrators be given the capability to identify curricula that are appropriate to their local situations and the particular needs of their students. This requires training programs to be 1) responsive to the needs assessments of the teachers and administrators involved, 2) sufficiently practical and specific so that teachers can know actual practices and materials that are thought to "work" in the implementation of chosen curricula, and 3) presented so that emphasis on practicality does not obscure the basic theories and propositions that underlie the content of new curricula. Without this third component, educators may find themselves saddled with specific programs that they think are appropriate while having no bases upon which to adapt and modify the curricula, much of which is prepackaged, to meet their students' needs and to know whether the adaptations they make are conducive to meeting the goals of the new curricula.

Evidence. King et al. (1980) indicate that inservice training in the area of curricula is common in newly desegregated districts. In general, training that emphasizes multiethnic and multicultural education, and to a certain extent basic skills, is thought effective for helping teachers adapt course content to the specific needs and interests of minority students. This study also indicates that training in curricula is more successful than training in interpersonal relations and discipline because curricular-related topics are perceived less value-laden. Often interpersonal relations and discipline programs are given a curricular emphasis to make staff training more value-neutral.

The System Development Corporation (1980) found that inservice training positively relates to increasing multiethnic knowledge of teachers and effective implementation of multiethnic curricula in the classroom. Case studies edited by Carney (1979b, 1979c, 1979d) provide further evidence that inservice education assists teachers implement multicultural curricula. In addition, they show that this type of training helps teachers identify instructional needs and interests of minority students and develop course content that meets those needs and interests.

Greene, Archambault and Nolen (1976) examined the impact of inservice training related to curricular content and instructional strategies on elementary teachers' knowledge of and attitudes toward teaching mathematics. The training investigated by the study was split into two sessions. The first was a summer session oriented toward approaches to math content; the second was conducted during the regular school year and emphasized implementation strategies. The study found that while significant increases in teachers' favorable attitudes toward teaching math were related to participation at both summer and regular school year sessions, the greatest determinant of improved teacher attitudes was attributable to the dissemination of new content approaches taught during the summer program. These findings, while not related to desegregated settings per se, do have implications for desegregation-related training. As suggested in the discussion of inservice training related to instructional methods, teachers need training opportunities to explore different content-area approaches that meet the educational needs of changed student bodies. Provision of new instructional strategies, while certainly helpful, is not enough to improve attitudes toward teaching unless these methods are couched in understandings of new approaches to content areas. It is reasonable to suggest, therefore, that teachers' attitudes toward their subject matter and, perhaps, toward students may best be improved by providing training incorporating both instructional strategies and approaches to content. This study by Greene et al. (1976) supports this contention.

Illustrative examples. Osthimer describes multiethnic inservice training conducted through an ethnic culture center in a midwestern school system of about 58,000 students (Carney, 1979c). Approximately 26% of the district's enrollment is minority. The overall purpose of this program is to train teachers in the theory, development and use of multiethnic curricula. In addition, emphasis is also placed on the professional growth of teachers who participate in the training. The program format centers around workshops led by outside consultants and in-district resource personnel. The first sessions emphasize discussion of the philosophy of cultural pluralism, separatism, and theories of ethnic and cultural mixing. Training focus then shifts to the development of specific sample lessons and instructing participants how to teach using multiethnic materials. Finally participants are helped to develop their own lessons to use with students. Although no follow-up component was built into the original plan of this training, some efforts were made to check individual schools and classrooms to see if multiethnic materials were being used and if their use had any impact on classroom activities. In order to correct perceived difficulties of integrating multiethnic emphases into the general curricula, additional training sessions were conducted on the basis of an informal needs assessment. This training component involves formulating lesson plans, implementing them in the classroom, reporting back to the training group, and then disseminating successful plans to other teachers.

In another case study, Osthimer describes inservice training in basic skills instruction conducted by a district located in a midwestern industrial center (Carney, 1979c). The district's student enrollment of 20,000 is 53% minority. The overall focus of inservice education in this district centers on curriculum-based and achievement-oriented training for desegregation, rather than more affective types of training. The district provides specific training in remedial instruction for designated teachers but offers programs to develop and implement comprehensive sequential basic skills training for teachers of all grade levels. This training is designed to encourage and allow for "diagnosis and individualization while maintaining multicultural, heterogeneous classrooms" (Carney, 1979c, pp. 14-15). Workshops are generally activity-oriented and provide materials for participants to take with them to their classrooms. They emphasize concepts of mastery learning, techniques of eliminating ability grouping in classrooms, and cooperative learning techniques in conjunction with the basic skills curriculum. Evaluations are conducted frequently and the results are used in developing future training programs.

Inservice Training in Self-Awareness, Empathy, Sensitivity, and Interpersonal Relations

There is general agreement that inservice training for teachers and staff in areas of student relations is a necessary component of desegregation. Most experts believe that increasing teacher selfawareness of their race-related attitudes and behavior is vital for improving student-teacher relations in desegregated settings. Furthermore, it is thought that increasing teacher empathy for and sensitivity to individual student's attitudes, behaviors, and instructional and psychological needs facilitates the development and implementation of more effective and less confrontive techniques in instruction, classroom management, and student discipline. Ideally, interpersonal relations and related training should sensitize teachers to enable them to better respond to the needs and behaviors of ethnically different students, as well as ethnically different colleagues. We use the term "interpersonal relations" rather than "human relations" to clarify a difference between educator-student, as well as educator-educator relationships, and more curricular and instructional programs instructional programs aimed at improving human or race relations among students.

A wide variety of approaches to interpersonal relations training exists in terms of both format and content and there is little agreement about which formats or content areas prove most effective. In general, however, three aspects of this type of training seem most important:

1. Training should concern itself with specific needs of individual schools and participants.
2. The effectiveness of training that seeks to change teacher attitudes and behavior appears to be directly related to a certain degree of preliminary self-awareness on the part of participants that interpersonal relations problems either exist or could exist in their particular setting and to the receptivity of training programs (Winecoff & Kelly, 1971). This receptivity is influenced by the degree to which participants believe training programs to be potentially effective.
3. Emphasis on changing attitudes is much less effective than training in behavioral responses to particular sources of interpersonal conflict or prejudice.

This last point should be stressed. Few people are willing to acknowledge that they are insensitive or prejudiced toward others, especially children of another race. Thus, working to change attitudes or increase sensitivity may seem unnecessary and even insulting to some educators. Interpersonal relations training should emphasize, therefore, the identification of positive behaviors in much the same way that training in teaching skills for math education focuses on theory and technique.

Evidence. Studies by Forehand, Ragosta and Rock (1976) and the System Development Corporation (1979) suggest that positive teacher racial attitudes are associated with enhanced minority achievement. This research is consistent with the "Pygmalion Effect" identified by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) and replicated in a large number of studies. Rosenthal's hypothesis is simply that the higher expectations teachers have for their students, the better students will perform in the classroom. While some retests of the Rosenthal hypothesis find no support for this theory, the emerging consensus of a very large number of studies is that the theory remains sound.

Acland (1975) identifies positive results of interpersonal relations training to improve teachers' attitudes and increase teachers' expectancies of minority students. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1976) reports that interpersonal relations training is effective to alter teachers' and administrators' attitudes and behavior that lead to differential treatment of students by race which in turn might result in within-classroom or within-school isolation. Such training is viewed as a positive means by which teachers and administrators may become more sensitive to and express more empathy toward minority students' instructional and psychological needs. Also, the System Development Corporation concludes that interpersonal relations training is related to creating "harmonious and cooperative" school environments that lead to positive interactions between teachers, staff and students and to improved student racial attitudes (1980, p. II-41).

Several studies indicate that training in interpersonal relations improves teachers' attitudes and student-teacher interactions. In addition, some evidence exists that this type of training relates to gains in student achievement. Data from an assessment of an ESEA Title III inservice training project in Los Angeles (1974) suggest that training teachers in supportive and motivating techniques with all students not only improves teacher attitudes toward "low achievers" but accelerates the academic growth of those low achieving students. Hillman and Davenport (1977) found that interpersonal relations training in Detroit increased "cross-race" student-teacher interactions in the classroom. Before training, these types of interactions occurred infrequently. It was noted in this study, however, that while cross-race interaction had increased as a result of training, in certain instances, minority students began receiving a disproportionate number of interactions. While the study deems increased frequency of cross-race interaction beneficial, it may be that too frequent interaction is dysfunctional to improved student-teacher relations.

In other studies of local inservice programs, Redman (1977) discovered significant increases in teacher empathy toward minority students as a result of interpersonal relations training in Minnesota public schools. In an earlier study of this Minnesota program, Carl and Jones (1972) found that participation in training increased teacher flexibility, self-awareness of attitudes and behavior, and sensitivity to colleagues and students.

Schniedewind (1975) evaluated an inservice training program in classroom strategies for dealing with racism and sexism implemented by a Maryland school district. The program focused on analysis and modification of teaching behavior, interpersonal relations, and microteaching. When compared with a control group, teachers who participated in training showed significant increases in self-awareness and confidence that they could change their attitudes and behavior and make a positive impact on the learning environment. Participants also exhibited signs of growing trust in colleagues. Finally, participants showed increased awareness of racism and sexism while a control group of non-participating teachers regressed slightly on this measure.

Our interviews with local experts indicate that interpersonal relations training has merit for desegregating school systems. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; Riverside, California; Shaker Heights, Ohio; Tuscon, Arizona; Seattle, Washington; and Evanston, Illinois, local experts stated that training ranged from being very beneficial to being absolutely essential. At other sites, there was a general feeling that not enough is being done in interpersonal relations training or that the training that is attempted is not done well enough. Some indication exists that criticism by local experts of interpersonal relations training is not a function of the usefulness of these programs, but that the training conducted was poorly conceived, planned, or implemented. Generally speaking, training conducted after implementation of the desegregation plan is seen as more effective than that done to prepare for desegregation prior to implementation.

Illustrative examples. The assistant superintendent for state and federal relations in Shaker Heights, Ohio was very favorable toward the Equal Opportunity in Classroom program. This training is designed to sensitize teachers to the needs of low achieving students and to monitor teachers' interactions with these students in terms of time of response and proximity to child. This respondent indicated that teacher testimony attested to a favorable impact of this program. A Riverside, California ESAA coordinator indentified successful outcomes of a similar program.

Bailey (1978) found that interpersonal relations training in Pinellas County, Florida was positively related to improved student-teacher relations and improved student attitudes and behavior as evidenced by decreases in student suspension rates. The training program investigated by Bailey is a component of a program entitled Positive Alternatives to Student Suspensions (PASS) that was developed by the St. Petersburg, Florida school system. The training is designed to evolve more effective communication systems between teachers and students, between teachers and administrators, and among teachers themselves through participation in nonthreatening activities that emphasize positive verbal expression. All school personnel are encouraged to participate in this training with the rationale that cooperation of each staff member is necessary to effectively humanize the school setting. Training exercises are extended into the classroom; specific periods of time are set aside over a twelve week period in which trainers assist teachers to implement activities with students that encourage openness in communication, sharing, social awareness, and personal growth.

Hunter and Hyman found evidence of effective human relations training in a western metropolitan school district of about 11,800 students (Carney, 1979d). Approximately 20% of this district's enrollment is minority. Generally, teachers and administrators attribute decreases in racial tensions among students to interpersonal relations training of teachers. Inservice training offers a variety of programs with enough frequency so that they are available to all staff members. To facilitate desegregation efforts, a cultural awareness program was initiated. The overall goals of this training are to promote positive staff behavior towards minority students and to increase staff awareness of the positive contributions of minorities to the historical development of the United States. Topics of discussion provided by this program include cultural awareness, myths, stereotypes, self-concept, poverty, institutional racism, and religion. Hunter and Hyman conclude that respondents generally believe that this program was very effective in helping teachers reach minority students, for whom they usually held very low expectations, and to better understand the links between students' environments and cultures and their behaviors.

Inservice Training in Discipline Techniques

Training for dealing with classroom behavior, ranging from lessened respect for authority to personal threat, is a need increasingly expressed by educators. Improving capacities in these areas may reduce the use of unnecessary suspensions or felt needs for grouping techniques that may address discipline problems but foster resegregation. This type of training seems particularly important in schools that are undergoing initial desegregation.

Classroom discipline techniques are generally grouped into two categories: preventative techniques and punitive techniques. There is agreement among experts that effective techniques to either prevent or correct discipline problems involve components of effective classroom management, empathy, sensitivity, and concepts of fairness, equal treatment of students and due process. Inservice training in the areas of interpersonal relations and classroom management through instructional strategies help foster attitudes and create more comfortable classroom environments that reduce antagonistic relations which might lead to discipline problems. Furthermore, such training may facilitate teacher attitudes and behavior that may better assist them deal with occurrences of discipline problems in an equitable and nonresegregative manner.

While inservice training in instructional strategies and interpersonal relations relate to ways in which teachers handle discipline in their classrooms, teachers often express a need for programs that equip them with specific techniques for practical application. Often, inservice programs that provide such techniques are effective in helping teachers develop methods to prevent and reprimand disruptive student behavior. We wish to stress, however, that this type of training may be ineffective in the long-run without the provision of inservice programs in interpersonal relations and instructional strategies that help teachers improve their overall attitudes about and relations with students and adopt non-punitive measures that seek to alter student behaviors that result in disciplinary problems. Similarly, human relations programs that foster better relationships among students and instructional strategies that contribute to academic success of students will probably reduce the need for disciplinary actions.

Evidence. King et al. (1980) find evidence that teacher requests for conflict/discipline management training differ considerably between desegregated and non-desegregated school districts. Teachers in recently desegregated districts request this type of training far more frequently than teachers in non-desegregated districts or districts that have been desegregated for some time. King reports that staff development in discipline techniques contributes to successful desegregation because staff members believe it acts to prevent desegregation-related student behavior problems. In addition, teachers and administrators tend to believe that this type of training enhances teachers' morale and perceptions of competence because it disseminates methods to deal with student behavior problems with which teachers might otherwise be unable to deal.

Carney (1979b, 1979c, 1979d) also indicates that there is great demand for inservice training in classroom discipline techniques among teachers in recently desegregated school systems. In case studies of exemplary programs, discipline-related training is but one part of a more comprehensive training agenda that, in most instances, places primary emphasis on interpersonal relations. Although the relative effectiveness of training in discipline techniques cannot be evaluated apart from other aspects of inservice programs, there is indication that the success of discipline-related programs is directly related to effective interpersonal relations training.

The available evidence does not suggest that interpersonal relations training can take the place of training in areas such as classroom management. As Borg (1977) found, training solely designed to improve teacher and student self-concepts and student-teacher interactions has little impact on reducing mildly and seriously deviant student behavior. Training in classroom management techniques was found to reduce this type of behavior.

Borg's study does not imply that programs on discipline techniques preclude training in interpersonal relations. Data presented by Brown, MacDougall and Jenkins (1972) suggest that while the solution to disciplinary problems lies in dissemination of classroom management techniques, eradication of disciplinary practices detrimental to learning seems to rest with providing teachers with training opportunities to assess their behavior in the classroom and improve their general interactions with students. This study found that teacher assessment of student ability to perform school-related tasks and propensity for good behavior in the classroom was related to student self-assessment on these measures. The findings of this study suggest that if teachers develop favorable concepts of students and those concepts are communicated through student-teacher interaction, student self-concepts will improve and discipline problems will decrease.

In a survey of research assessing the effectiveness of inservice training and staffing to help schools manage student conflict and alienation, Hyman (1979) found scattered evidence to indicate that inservice programs do help reduce student discipline problems. Hyman suggests that training in discipline techniques and interpersonal relations has a positive effect on changing teachers' attitudes toward students and that these improvements in attitudes are helpful in improving student self-images, reducing punitive teacher behavior, and decreasing incidences of disruptive student behavior. When these changes occur on a school-wide basis, the total learning climate is enhanced.

From our interviews with national and local experts, it appears that discipline is not a primary content area for inservice training even though this type of training is thought to be significant. In general, discipline-related programs implemented early in the school year are important because the norms for acceptable student behavior tend to be set by the third or fourth week of school. At the same time, follow-up training and support mechanisms for educators appear to be important to program success.

Illustrative examples. The Positive Alternatives to Student Suspensions Program of the St. Petersburg Schools appears to have effectively combined inservice training in interpersonal relations and school and classroom discipline techniques (Bailey, 1978). The program offers participants strategies for "crisis/remedial" interventions that include use of a "time-out" room to which students are sent to talk out their problems and devise plans to resolve their difficulties with a "facilitative listener." Another strategy of the program is the development of a student school survival course. Students with recurrent behavioral problems are referred to this course that meets once a week. Under the guidance of a skilled leader, students learn that it is possible to survive in school and to receive positive feedback from teachers, administrators and other students. Training in these crisis/remedial intervention strategies is accompanied by extensive interpersonal relations programs designed to prevent disciplinary problems. These programs focus on increasing teacher sensitivity to students' behavior and needs, and helping teachers devise means by which classroom environments and student-teacher relations may be improved.

Graubard and King identify other effective inservice training in discipline techniques (Carney, 1979b). In a newly consolidated school district of approximately 65,000 students, 30% of whom are minority, an elementary principal spends the greatest portion of inservice time training teachers on positive approaches to student behavior. During the first week of the school year, teachers work toward developing a consensus about the behavior-related rules of the school and getting students to "buy in" to those rules. Participants in this program believe the program was successful because it was directed by the principal who was more aware of their individual needs than would be a trainer from outside the school. Furthermore, teachers are able to contribute to the development of rules and discipline procedures which increase their dedication to and involvement in the program.

Inservice Training for Parent Involvement in School Affairs

Almost all experts on school desegregation stress the importance of various ways of involving parents in the schools and, more particularly, in the education of their children. At the same time, teachers and administrators appear to receive very little training on how to relate to parents and involve them more effectively in school affairs.

Desegregation can lead to special problems in parent-school relations and inservice training might focus on means by which these relations can be improved. Because desegregation invariably increases the heterogeneity of a school's student body, educators must relate to a different and more diverse group of parents. This suggests a need for teachers and administrators to understand differences in the behavior and values of parents with varied cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. The kind of lessons educators need to learn about students they also need to learn about parents. In specific, communication skills, awareness of power and status differences, and techniques parents can use to help their children learn should be part of this type of training program.

Because parents may have to travel further to school after desegregation and into neighborhoods in which they may not feel comfortable, educators need to consider ways to involve parents other than those traditionally used. For example, parent-teacher conferences and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings might be held in different neighborhoods and teachers may want to visit homes rather than waiting for parents to come to school. Activities designed to include parents must be scheduled at times that do not conflict with work.

School desegregation may establish an adversarial relationship between groups of parents and the schools. Some parents, for example, who oppose desegregation may resist participating in school activities or be angry at the changes taking place that result from desegregation. Other parents, by virtue of their participation on advisory councils and in monitoring groups, may be seen as threatening by educators. These possibilities should be discussed, and ways of relating to parents who take a skeptical view of schools or who share in the traditional authority of educators, need to be developed.

Evidence. There is virtually no literature on this topic and few of our interviewees mention the matter. The suggestions above are based on inferences made by considering together the changes in teacher-parent relationships that may result from desegregation, the types of parent involvement urged by the strategies identified in other sections of this report, and the literature and perspectives on other aspects of inservice training.

Illustrative examples. The literature provides few examples of inservice training programs for school personnel designed to encourage parent involvement in school affairs. The Institute for Teacher Leadership (1979) does, however, describe two such programs. In 1973, the New Brunswick Education Association began a three year training program that involved both school and community participants. One component of this program was the training of teachers and local education association leaders to plan and implement parent-student activities to increase parent involvement in school affairs. The Denver, Colorado school system instituted a number of inservice training programs that included sessions designed to encourage parent-teacher communication and to train teachers in methods to stimulate parent interest in school curricula, parentteacher organizations, and other school activities.

Inservice Preparation for Principals and Administrative Staffs

Principals play an extremely important role in influencing the course of student race relations, achievement, and the nature of student behavior in school. Partly, this is because of explicit actions that principals must take to resolve matters that involve race. Examples of such actions are student discipline and assignment of students to classrooms. In addition, principals' racial attitudes and behavior become models for teachers and students in schools. The importance of the principal in setting a school-wide tone for race relations implies that there should be more inservice preparation for principals than is presently offered. While virtually all experts agree that principals are very important to effective desegregation (e.g., Beckum & Dasho, 1981b), very little such training occurs and very little has been written on how to prepare principals and other administrators for desegregation. It seems likely, however, that the same general strategies that apply to both the content and the character of teacher training discussed in previous strategies should be applied to training principals.

In particular, Davison (1973) proposes the following strategies for inservice training of principals and administrators:

1. Planning of inservice programs for administrators should include selected participants who might later serve as leaders of the training sessions.

2. Incentives should be provided to facilitate full participation. It should not be assumed that administrators are more eager to participate in training than teachers.

3. Program content should be designed to ensure balance and association between theory and philosophical understandings and their practical application to specific situations.

4. Inservice training for administrators will be more successful if it is designed to address specific needs of participants.

5. Training should emphasize concrete ways that administrators can consider, develop, and implement new administrative practice. Programs should not be critical of existing practice, but should provide means by which that practice may be examined and perhaps amended.

6. Inservice training for administrators should engender commitment to educational change and provide a knowledge base for such commitment.

School administrators in desegregating systems probably need further training in helping teachers to deal with stress, organizing the system of pupil transportation (which is more than a logistical problem), dealing with the media, grantsmanship, and, at the district level, managing external financial resources. Colton (1978) presents a comprehensive discussion of this type of financial management. Of course, other members of administrative staffs influence school climate. Assistant principals, deans, and guidance counselors should also undertake inservice training related to desegregation.

Evidence. Turnage (1972), Crain, Mahard and Narot (1981), Forehand and Ragosta (1976), and St. John (1975) all stress the importance of principals' behavior in influencing school climate. The safe schools study (National Institute of Education, 1978) found that differences among secondary schools in levels of student crime, misbehavior, and violence are strongly related to the degree of school-level coordination of discipline policy by the principal. The study concludes that a school's overall climate will be safer and teachers will like and perform better in school if principals see that all teachers follow the same general set of rules and that those rules are clearly communicated to students. In addition, principals must promote mutual reinforcement of teacher and administrator behavior and help teachers maintain discipline within their classrooms.

The System Development Corporation (1980) concludes that inservice training for principals in interpersonal relations has a positive relationship to improving overall school climate and to improving student racial attitudes. Findings suggest that such training promotes a harmonious and cooperative school environment that leads to positive interactions not only among students but among students and teachers, teachers themselves, and among administrators and teachers.

There is some evidence from case studies that principals indirectly influence the climate of their schools by the emphases they place on the inservice training of teachers (Carney, 1979b, 1979c, 1979d). Principals that express strong support of teacher training in interpersonal relations, instructional strategies, and discipline, and themselves participate in such training, further the improvement of school climate. In addition, involvement of principals in the training of teachers creates an atmosphere of cohesion and administrative support of teachers. Beckum and Dasho (1981a) support these findings in their case studies and argue that administrative leadership and participation is essential to the adoption of school-wide improvement. They further contend that principals must be informed and committed to training if desired outcomes are to occur.

The importance of the principal's role in shaping the school climate is emphasized in Gottfredson and Daiger's (1979) recent reanalysis of the

Safe Schools (1978b) data. The authors identify the following factors as important to minimizing interpersonal conflict within schools.

1. Principals should stress the importance of desegregation and improving race relations publicly and with conviction.

2. They should support teachers in their efforts to alter their behavior and manage their classrooms and prohibit teacher practices that discourage good race relations.

3. They should help draft and fairly administer rules of conduct for students and staff.

The development of capabilities of school principals to achieve these conditions seems to be an important goal of training programs for school administrators.

Illustrative examples. Carney found evidence that comprehensive inservice training involving principals, administrative staffs, and teachers in interpersonal relations, curricula, instructional strategies, and discipline effectively reduced problems in the desegregation of a midwestern unified school district of approximately 26,000 students (Carney, 1979c). Principals and other administrative staff members were required to attend training sessions that also emphasized bilingual education, multicultural education, and assessment of the district's progress in desegregating its schools. Retreats were held for principals and administrative staff members that concentrated on crisis management and interpersonal relations. In addition, administrators attended inservice training for teachers that emphasized multicultural education, instructional strategies, and interpersonal relations. Much of the effectiveness of this program was attributable to the comprehensive training of both administrators and teachers, separately and together.

In another case study, inservice training for principals and other administrators that focused on understanding of the district's desegregation plan and school-community relations was found to promote a smooth transition of three districts into a consolidated system (Carney, 1979d). Although most other inservice training programs in interpersonal relations, curricula and instructional strategies were designed for teachers, administrators were encouraged to attend. Formats of these programs varied and included workshops, seminars, university classes, and participant exchange.

References

Acland, H. *Secondary analysis of the Emergency School Assistance Program*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Coporation, 1975.

Ahmadjian-Baer, J. *Producing more active learning behavior from poor readers: The multiple ability classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Alexander, D. *An investigation into the absence of black parental involvement in desegregated schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Allen, H. M., Jr., & Sears, O. *White opposition to busing in Los Angeles: Is self-interest rejuvenated*? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, August 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 166 353)

Allport, G. W. *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.

Anchondo, J. J., Cabrera, G. M., Gerlach, E., & Rodriguez, E., Jr. *Working with your school: A handbook of the New Mexico Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights*. Santa Fe, N.M.: New Mexico Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 148 501) (a)

Anchondo, J. J., Cabrera, G. M., Gerlach, E., & Rodriguez, E., Jr. *Working with your school: A handbook of the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights*. Austin, Tex.: Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 148 539) (b)

Armor, D. White flight and the future of school desegregation. In W. G. Stephan & J. R. Feagin (Eds.), *Desegregation: Past, present, and future*. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Armor, D., Conry-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. *Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, August 1976.

Arnez, N. L. Implementation of desegregation as a discriminatory process. *Journal of Negro Education*, 1978, *47*, 28-45.

Arnove, R. F., & Strout, T. Alternative schools for disruptive youth. *Educational Forum*, 1980, *44*, 453-471.

Bader, P. A counseling alternative to suspension: School youth advocacy. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), *Student rights and discipline*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1978.

Bailey, R. Staff, student and parent training as positive alternatives to student suspensions. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), Student rights and discipline: Policies, programs and procedures. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, Program for Educational Opportunity, 1978.

Banks, J. A. The emerging states of ethnicity: Implications for staff development. Educational Leadership, 1976, 34, 190-193.

Banks, J. A. Shaping the future of multi-cultural education. Journal of Negro Education, 1979, 45, 237-252.

Banks, W. H., Jr. What to do until the court order comes. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 58, 557-561.

Barker, R. G., & Gump, P. V. Big school - small school. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Beady, C. H., & Hansell, S. Teacher race and expectations for student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18, 191-206.

Beady, C. H., Jr., Slavin, R. E., & Fennessey, G. M. Alternative student evaluation structures in desegregated classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, (forthcoming).

Beckum, L. C., & Dasho, S. J. Confronting diversity: A multi-disciplinary study of teacher training needs in newly desegregated schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Beckum, L. C., & Dasho, S. J. Accommodating diversity: An assessment of teacher training needs in newly desegregated schools. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, April 1981. (a)

Beckum, L. C., & Dasho, S. J. Managing social change: Administrative decision-making in desegregating schools. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, April 1981. (b)

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change (Vol. 7). Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, April 1977.

Blanchard, F. A., Weigel, R., & Cook, S. W. The effect of relative competence of group members upon interpersonal attraction in cooperating interracial groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 519-530.

Blom, G., White, R., & Zimet, S. Ethnic integration and urbanization of a first-grade reading textbook: A research study. Psychology in the Schools, 1967, 4(2), 176-181.

Boardman, A. E., Lloyd, A. S., & Wood, D. The process of education for twelfth grade Asian American students. Journal of Public Policy and Multicultural Education, 1978, 1(4), 338-353.

Borg, W. R. Changing teacher and pupil performance with protocols. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 1977, *45*(3), 9-18.

Braddock, J. H., II, & McPartland, J. M. *The perpetuation of segregation from elementary-secondary schools to higher education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Braun, M. Toward teacher training for "desegregated" schools: Organization, content and sociocultural context. *Education and Urban Society*, 1977, *9*, 353-368.

Bridge, G., Judd, C., & Moock, P. *The determinants of educational outcomes: The effects of families, peers, teachers and schools*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1979.

Brown, J. A., MacDougall, M. A., & Jenkins, C. A. *Changing culture perceptions of elementary school teachers* (ED Occasional Paper No. 9). Charlottesville, Va.: The University of Virginia, School of Education, April 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 066 537)

Budoff, M. Learning potential: A supplementary procedure for assessing the ability to reason. *Seminars in Psychiatry*, 1972, *10*, 199-205.

Cabrera, G. M., Gerlach, E., Rodriguez, E., Jr., & Smegelsky, S. L. *Working with your school: A handbook of the Arkansas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights*. Little Rock, Ark.: Arkansas State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, July 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 174 732)

Campbell, B. A. The impact of school desegregation: An investigation of three mediating variables. *Youth and Society*, 1977, *9*(9), 79-111.

Carl, M. E., & Jones, L. W. *Some preliminary observations regarding the Minnesota State Human Relations Requirement and its effect on in-service teachers*. Moorhead, Minn.: Moorhead State College, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 083 202)

Carney, M. *Inservice education for desegregation: A review of the literature*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, November 1979. (a)

Carney, M. (Ed.). *Inservice training in desegregated school districts: Eastern region case studies*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, August 1979. (b)

Carney, M. (Ed.). *Inservice training in desegregated school districts: Midwestern region case studies*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, August 1979. (c)

Carney, M. (Ed.). *Inservice training in desegregated school districts: Western region case studies*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, August 1979. (d)

Carter, T. P. *Interface between bilingual education and desegregation: A study of Arizona and California*. Unpublished manuscript, California State University at Sacramento, 1979.

Chow, S. H. L., Rice, C. F., & Whitmore, L. A. *Effects of a mediated training course on teachers and students in mainstreaming programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 123 822)

Cohen, E. G. *The desegregated school: Problems in status power and interracial climate*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, September 1979.

Cohen, E. G. *A multi-ability approach to the integrated classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, September 1980.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. *Equality of educational opportunity* (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education Publication No. 38001). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, J. S., Kelly, S. D., & Moore, J. A. *Trends in school segregation, 1968-1973*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1975.

Colton, D. L., & Berg, W. M. *Budgeting for desegregation in large cities* (Final Report). St. Louis, Mo.: Washington University, Center for the Study of Law in Education, January 1981.

Cook, V. J. *Psychometric critique of school testing litigation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, September 1979.

Cotton, W. H. Strategies for reducing the disproportionate racial impact on suspensions: The Dallas experience. In C. D. Moody, J. Williams & C. B. Vergon (Eds.), *Student rights and discipline*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1978.

Coulson, J. E. *National evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA): Summary of second-year studies*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, July 1976.

Crain, R. L. Racial tension in high schools: Pushing the survey method closer to reality. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 1977, *8*, 142-151.

Crain, R. L., & Mahard, R. Desegregation and black achievement: A review of the research. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 1978, *42*(3), 17-56.

Crain, R. L., & Mahard, R. *The influence of high school racial composition on the academic achievement and college attendance of Hispanics*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal, August 1980.

Crain, R. L., & Mahard, R. Some policy implications of the desegregation-minority achievement literature. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), *Assessment of current knowledge about the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies* (Volume 5). Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Center for Education and Human Development Policy, April 1981.

Crain, R. L., Mahard, R. E., & Narot, R. E. *Making desegregation work: How schools create social climates*. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Press, 1981.

Cunningham, G. K., & Husk, W. L. *A metropolitan desegregation plan: Where the white students went*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 169 205)

Cunningham, G. K., Husk, W. L., & Johnson, J., Jr. *The impact of court-ordered desegregation on student enrollment and residential patterns (white flight)*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978.

Damico, S. B., Green, C., & Bell-Nathaniel, A. *Facilitating interracial contact: Let the structure do it for you*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Davis, J. Busing. In *Southern schools: An evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of desegregation*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1973.

Davison, R. G. Better in-service programs for school administrators. *The Clearinghouse*, April 1973, pp. 498-501.

Demarest, S., & Jordan, J. F. *Hawkins* v. *Coleman*: Discriminating suspensions and the effect of institutional racism on school discipline. *Inequality in Education*, 1975, *26*, 25-34.

Devin-Sheehan, L., Feldman, R. S., & Allen, V. L. Research on children tutoring children: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 1976, *46*, 355-385.

Dornbusch, S. M., & Fernandez, C. The effects of teacher praise and warmth on student effort: A socio-cultural comparative analysis of Chicano and Anglo high school students. *California Sociologist*, 1979, *2*(1), 1-28.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. *The first weeks of school . . . and the rest of the year*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Epstein, J. *After the bus arrives: Resegregation in desegregated schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Erbe, B. Student attitudes and behavior in a desegregated school system. *Integrated Education*, 1977, *15*(6), 123-125.

ESEA Title III project: Equal opportunity in the classroom, 1973-74 (National Validation Report). Downey, Calif.: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1974.

Estabrook, L. S. The effect of desegregation on parents' evaluations of schools (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1980, *41*, 6443A. (University Microfilms No. 80-13, 278)

Evertson, C. M., Sanford, J. P., & Emmer, E. T. Effects of class heterogeneity in junior high school. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18, 219-232.

Fantini, M. D. (Ed.). Alternative education: A source book for parents, teachers, students and administrators. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1976.

Farley, R., Bianchi, S., & Colosanto, D. Barriers to the racial integration of neighborhoods. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Quarterly, 1979, 441, 97-113.

Felkner, D. W., Goering, J., & Linden, K. W. Teacher rigidity and continuing education. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 460-463.

Fernandez, R. R., & Guskin, J. T. Hispanic students and school desegregation. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), Effective school desegregation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1981.

Feuerstein, R. The dynamic assessment of retarded performers. Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press, 1979.

Findley, W. G., & Bryan, M. M. Ability grouping, 1970: Status, impact, and alternatives. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, Center for Educational Improvement, 1971.

First, J., & Mizell, M. H. (Eds.). Everybody's business: A book about school discipline. Columbia, S.C.: Southeastern Public Education Program, 1980.

Fitzmaurice, M. D. Learning institute in-service results. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, Anaheim, California, May 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 127 554)

Forehand, G. A., & Ragosta, M. A handbook for integrated schooling. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Forehand, G. A., Ragosta, M., & Rock, D. A. Conditions and processes of effective school desegregation. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 131 155)

Foster, G. Discipline practices in the Hillsborough County public schools. Unpublished manuscript, University of Miami at Coral Gables, School Desegregation Consulting Center, April 1977.

Froman, R. D. Ability grouping: Why do we persist and should we? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Garibaldi, A. In-school alternatives to suspension: The state of the art. In In-school alternatives to suspension (Conference report). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, April 1979.

Gartner, A., Kohler, M. C., & Riessman, F. Children teach children. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Genova, W. J., & Walberg, H. J. A practitioners' guide for achieving student integration in city high schools. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, November 1980.

Gerard, H. B., & Miller, N. (Eds.). School desegregation: A long-range study. New York: Plenum Press, 1976.

Giles, M. W., Gatlin, D. S., & Cataldo, E. F. Racial and class prejudice: Their relative effects on protest against school desegregation. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 280-288.

Glass, G. V., & Smith, M. L. Meta-analysis of research on the relationship of class size and achievement. Boulder, Colo.: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research, 1978.

Gottfredson, G. D., & Daiger, D. C. Disruption in 600 schools (Technical Report No. 289). Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, 1979.

Green, R. L., & Griffore, R. School desegregation, testing, and the urgent need for equity in education. Education, 1978, 99(1), 16-19.

Greene, J. F., Archambault, F., & Nolen, W. The effect of extended in-service training curricula upon the mathematics achievement and attitudes of elementary teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 123 091)

Guthrie, J. W. Organizational scale and school success. In Education finance and organization: Research perspectives for the future. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, January 1980.

Hall, L. The implementor's revenge. Southern Exposure, 1979, 7(2), 122-125.

Hargrove, E., Graham, S., Ward, L., Abernethy, V., Cunningham, J., & Vaughn, W. Regulations and schools: The implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Education Act. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, 1981.

Harnischfeger, A., & Wiley, D. E. A merit assessment of vocational education programs in secondary schools. A statement to the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, September 1980.

Hawley, W. D. (Ed.). Effective school desegregation: Studies by the National Review Panel on School Desegregation Research. Beverly Hills, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1981. (a)

Hawley, W. D. Increasing the effectiveness of school desegregation: Lessons from the research. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1981. (b)

Hayes, J. G. Anti-busing protest. Paper presented at the meeting of the North Carolina Education Association, Charlotte, November 1977.

Haywood, H. C. Alternative to normative assessment. In P. Mittler (Ed.), *Research to practice in mental retardation: Education and training* (Vol. 2). Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press, 1977.

Hillman, S. B., & Davenport, G. G. *Teacher behavior in desegregated schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 138 670)

Hochschild, J., & Hadrick, V. *The character and effectiveness of citizen monitoring groups in implementing civil rights in public schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education and the Office for Civil Rights, 1980.

Howey, K. R. *Inservice teacher education: A study of the perceptions of teachers, professors, and parents about current and projected practice*. Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 701)

Hyman, I. A. *An analysis of studies on effectiveness of training and staffing to help schools manage student conflict and alienation: A report*. Philadelphia: Temple University, National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives in the Schools, January 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 378)

Institute for Teacher Leadership. *The prevention of resegregation: Strategies for teachers*. Fullerton, Calif.: California State University, Institute for Teacher Leadership, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 174 723)

Johnson, R. A. Renewal of school placement systems for the handicapped. In F. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard & M. LaVor (Eds.), *Public policy and the education of exceptional children*. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Kaeser, S. *Orderly schools that serve all children: A review of successful schools in Ohio*. Cleveland, Oh.: Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 150) (a)

Kaeser, S. C. Suspensions in school discipline. *Education and Urban Society*, 1979, *11*, 465-486. (b)

Katz, P. *Modification of children's racial attitudes*. New York: City University of New York, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 882)

Kentucky Commission on Human Rights. *Six ways to avoid busing*. Louisville, Ky.: Kentucky Commission on Human Rights, 1975.

Kentucky Commission on Human Rights. *Housing and school desegregation increased by Section 8 moves: Under public housing program most black families chose Jefferson County suburbs* (Staff Report 80-1). Louisville, Ky.: Kentucky Commission on Human Rights, April 1980.

King, N. *The Los Angeles experience in monitoring desegregation: Progress and prospects*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1980.

King, N. J., Carney, M., & Stasz, C. *Staff development programs in desegregated settings* (Report for the National Institute of Education). Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, February 1980.

Kluger, R. *Simple justice: The history of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America's struggle for equality*. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Koslin, S., Koslin, B., & Pargament, R. *Efficacy of school integration policies in reducing racial polarization*. New York: Riverside Research Institute, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 610)

Kozol, J. The rebirth of education in Boston. *American Education*, June 1980, pp. 6-14.

Kruse, M. L. *The effects of increasing teacher competencies as related to improved secondary student reading scores*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, Anaheim, California, May 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 128 776)

Larkins, G. A., & Oldham, S. E. Patterns of racial separation in a desegregated high school. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 1976, *4*(2), 23-28.

Litcher, J. H., & Johnson, D. W. Changes in attitudes toward Negroes of white elementary school students after use of multiethnic readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1969, *60*(2), 148-152.

Longshore, D. *The control threat in desegregated schools: Exploring the relationship between school racial composition and intergroup hostility*. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, 1981.

Lord, D. J. School busing and white abandonment of public schools. *Southeastern Geographer*, 1975, *15*, 81-92.

Loveridge, R. L. *Parent perceptions of magnet schools as a method of desegregation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 384)

Mackler, B. Children have rights too! *The Crisis*, 1974, *81*, 235-238.

Marcum, R. B. An exploration of the first year effects of racial integration of the elementary schools in a unit district (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1969, *30*, 69A. (University Microfilms No. 69-10, 784)

Marshall, K. The desegregation of a Boston classroom. *Learning*, 1975, *4*, 33-40.

Massachusetts Research Center. *Education and enrollments: Boston during Phase II*. Boston: Massachusetts Research Center, 1976.

Mayeske, G. W., & Beaton, A. F., Jr. *Special studies of our nation's students*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 701)

Mayo, S. T. *Measures in education: Mastery learning and mastery testing* (A Special Report). E. Lansing, Mich.: National Council on Measurement in Education, March 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 151 299)

McConahay, J. B. Reducing racial prejudice in desegregated schools. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), *Effective school desegregation*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1981.

McConahay, J. B., & Hawley, W. D. *Reactions to busing in Louisville: Summary of adult opinions in 1976 and 1977*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Center for Educational Policy, 1978.

Mercer, J. R. *Labelling the mentally retarded*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1973.

Mercer, J. R., & Lewis, J. F. *System of multicultural pluralistic assessment*. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1978.

Metz, M. *Questioning the centipede: Sources of climate in a magnet school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Miller, J. D. Student suspensions in Boston: Derailing desegregation. *Inequality in Education*, 1975, No. 20, pp. 16-24.

Mills, R., & Bryan, M. M. *Testing . . . grouping: The new segregation in southern schools?* Atlanta: Southern Regional Council, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 131 124)

Moore, J. W., & Schaut, J. A. Stability of teaching behavior, responsiveness to training and teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1976, *69*, 360-363.

Murphy, H. R. *District and community characteristics influencing desegregation strategy choice and effectiveness*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Narot, R. E. Teacher prejudice and teacher behavior in desegregated schools. In *Southern schools: An evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of desegregation*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1973.

National Institute of Education. *Compensatory education study: A final report*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978. (a)

National Institute of Education. *Violent schools--safe schools: The safe school study report to the Congress* (Vol. 1). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1978. (b)

National Institute of Education. *In-school alternatives to suspension* (Conference report). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, April 1979.

National School Public Relations Association. *Suspensions and expulsions: Current trends in school policies and programs*. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1976.

Natkin, G. L. *The effects of busing on second grade students' achievement test scores (Jefferson County, Kentucky).* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Nitko, A. J., & Hsu, T. C. Using domain-referenced tests for student placement diagnosis and attainment in a system of adaptive individualized instruction. *Educational Technology*, 1974, 48-54.

Noboa, A. *An overview of trends in segregation of Hispanic students in major school districts having large Hispanic enrollment* (Final Report). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, January 1980.

Oakes, J. *Tracking and educational inequality within schools: Findings from a study of schooling*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Orfield, G. Report to the court, *Crawford* v. *Los Angeles*, City of Los Angeles, Case No. 822-854, Los Angeles County Superior Court, 1978.

Orfield, G. Housing patterns and desegregation policy. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), *Effective school desegregation*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1981.

Pearce, D. *Breaking down barriers: New evidence on the impact of metropolitan school desegregation on housing patterns*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, November 1980.

Peckham, R. F. *Larry P. et al.* v. *Wilson Riles et al.*, 343 F. Supp. 1306 (N.D. Cal. 1972).

Peretti, P. O. Effects of teachers' attitudes on discipline problems in schools recently desegregated. *Education*, 1976, *97*, 136-140.

Plisko, V. W., & Noell, J. Elementary and secondary education. In *The condition of education: Statistical report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Ragosta, M., Holland, P. W., & Jamison, D. T. *Computer assisted instruction and compensatory education: The ETS/LAUSD study* (Final Implementation Report, 1978-79 School Year). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1980.

Redman, G. L. Study of the relationship of teacher empathy for minority persons and inservice relations training. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1977, *70*, 205-210.

Regens, J. C., & Bullock, C. S., III. Congruity of racial attitudes among black and white students. *Social Science Quarterly*, 1979, *60*, 511-522.

Rist, R. C. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1970, *40*, 411-451.

Rist, R. C. *Desegregated schools: Appraisals of an American experiment*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Rosenholtz, S. J. The multiple abilities curriculum: An intervention against the self-fulfilling prophecy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1977.

Rosenholtz, S. J. Treating problems of academic status. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch, Jr. (Eds.), Status attributions and justice. New York: Elsevier, 1980.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Rossell, C. H. District council liaison committee monitoring report. Boston: Citywide Coordinating Council, August 1977.

Rossell, C. H. Assessing the unintended impacts of public policy: School desegregation and resegregation. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978. (a)

Rossell, C. H. The effect of community leadership and the mass media on public behavior. Theory Into Practice, 1978, 8, 131-139. (b)

Rossell, C. H. School desegregation and community social change. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42(3), 133-183. (c)

Rossell, C. H. Magnet schools as a desegregation tool: The importance of contextual factors in explaining their success. Urban Education, 1979, 14, 303-320.

Rossell, C. H. The effectiveness of desegregation plans in reducing racial isolation, white flight, and achieving a positive community response. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), An assessment of effective desegregation strategies: Preliminary report. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, Institute of Policy Science and Public Affairs, Center for Educational Policy, 1980.

Rossell, C. H., & Hawley, W. D. Understanding white flight from school desegregation and doing something about it. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), Effective school desegregation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 1981.

Rossell, C. H., & Ross, J. M. The long-term effect of court-ordered desegregation on student enrollment in central city public school systems: The case of Boston, 1974-1979 (Report prepared for the Boston School Department). Unpublished manuscript, Boston University, 1979.

St. John, N. School desegregation: Outcomes for children. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Schniedewind, N. Integrating personal and social change in teacher training: A project report. New Paltz, N.Y.: State University College, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 150 095)

Schofield, J. W. Desegregation school practices and student race relations outcomes. In W. D. Hawley (Ed.), *Assessment of current knowledge about the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies* (Vol. 5). Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Center for Education and Human Development Policy, 1981.

Sharan, S. Cooperative learning in small groups: Research methods and effects on achievement, attitudes and ethnic relations. *Review of Educational Research*, 1980, *50*, 241-272.

Sherif, M. Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1958, *68*, 349-356.

Shipman, V., Boroson, M., Bridgeman, B., Gant, J., & Mikovsky, M. *Notable early characteristics of high and low achieving black low-SES children*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, December 1976.

Slavin, R. E. *Multicultural student team instructional programs and race relations in desegregated schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978.

Slavin, R. E. Cooperative learning in teams: State of the art. *Educational Psychologist*, 1980, *15*, 93-111.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. School practices that improve race relations. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1979, *16*, 169-180.

Smith, A. D., Downs, A., & Lachman, M. *Achieving effective desegregation*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Company, 1979.

Southern Regional Council. A conflict of cultures. *Southern Exposure*, 1979, *7*(2), 126-128.

Southern Regional Council and the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial. *The student push-out: Victim of continued resistance to desegregation*. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Council, 1973.

Southern schools: An evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of desegregation (Vol. 1). Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1973.

Stearns, M. S., Green, D., & David, J. L. *Local implementation of PL 94-142: First year report of a longitudinal study*. Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, Education Research Center, April 1980.

Stuart, R. Busing and the media in Nashville. *New South*, 1973, *28*(2), 79-87.

The Study Group on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. *School participation and school quality: Attendance, suspension and dropouts in the Cleveland public schools*. A report presented to the Office for School Monitoring and Community Relations and the Cleveland Board of Education, 1978.

Stulac, J. *The self-fulfilling prophecy: Modifying the effects of a unidimensional perception of academic competence in task-oriented groups*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

System Development Corporation. *Human relations study: Measures of student performance* (Report TM-5972/006/00). Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, May 1979.

System Development Corporation. *Human relations study: Investigations of effective human relations strategies* (Technical Report, Vol. 2). Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, June 1980.

Taeuber, K. E., & Wilson, F. D. *Analysis of trends in school segregation*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, Institute for Research on Poverty, October 1979.

Taylor, D. G., & Stinchcombe, A. *The Boston school desegregation controversy*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1977.

Thomas, C. B. *Race relations in desegregated schools of different racial and social class compositions*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Turnage, M. *The principal as change-agent in desegregation*. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1972.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Fulfilling the letter and spirit of the law: Desegregation of the nation's public schools*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Weatherly, R. L. *Reforming special education: Policy implementation from state level to street level*. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1979.

Weinberg, M. *Minority students: A research appraisal*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1977. (a)

Weinberg, M. (Ed.). The status of desegregation in American cities: Implications for the state role. *Research Review of Equal Education*, 1977, *1*(4), 3-40. (b)

Wellish, J. B., Marcus, A., MacQueen, A. H., & Duck, G. A. *An in-depth study of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) schools: 1974-1975*. (U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, July 1976.

Whitmore, P. G., Melching, W. H., & Frederickson, E. W. *Gain in student achievement as a function of inservice teacher training in classroom management techniques* (Technical Report No. 72-26). Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization, October 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 127 304)

Williams, D. L., Jr. *Validation of effective staff development/inservice education strategies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Winecoff, H. L., & Kelly, E. Problems in school desegregation: Real or imaginary? *Integrated Education*, 1971, *9*(11), 3-10.

Working with your schools: A handbook of the Louisiana Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, D.C.: Louisiana State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, July 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 164 656)

Wright, L. The new word is PUSHOUT. Race Relations Reporter, 1973, 4(9), 8-13.

Yarger, S. J., Howey, K. R., & Joyce, B. R. Inservice teacher education. Palo Alto, Calif.: Boodsend Laboratory, n.d.

Zoloth, B. The impact of busing on student achievement: A reanalysis. Growth and Change, 1976, 7(7), 43-52.